AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF MADRAS GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

IN INDIA.

BUTTERWORTH & Co. (LTD.), 6, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
R. CAMBRAY & Co., Calcutta.
E. M. GOPALAKRISHNA KONE, Pudumantapam, Madura.
HARTLEYS, Mount Road, Madras.
HIGGINBOTHAMS (LTD.), Mount Road, Madras.
V. KALYANARAMA IYER & Co., Esplanade, Madras.
G. C. LOGANATHAM BROTHERS, Madras.
S. MURTHY & Co., Madras.
G. A. NATESAN & Co., Madras.
The Superintendent, NAZAIR KANUN HIND PRESS, Allahabad.
NIVASARKAR, Manager, "Hitawada," Nagpur.
P. R. RAMA IYER & Co., Madras.
RAMAKRISHNA & SONS, Lahore.
R. SUNDER PANDURANG, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
D. B. TARAPOREVALA SONS & Co., Bombay.
THACKER & Co. (LTD.), Bombay.
THACKER, SPINK & Co., 3, Esplanade East, Calcutta.
S. VAS & Co., Madras.
S.P.C.K. PRESS, Vepery, Madras.

IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

B. H. BLACKWELL, 50 and 51, Broad Street, Oxford.
CONSTABLE & Co., 10, Orange Street, Leicester Square, London, W.C.
DEIGHTON, BELL & Co. (LTD.), Cambridge.
T. FISHER UNWIN (LTD.), 1, Adelphi Terrace, London, W.C.
GRINDLAY & Co., 54, Parliament Street, London, S.W.
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co. (LTD.), 68—74, Carter Lane, London, E.C., and 39, New Oxford Street, London, W.C.
HENRY S. KING & Co., 65, Cornhill, London, E.C.
P. S. KING & SON, 2 and 4, Great Smith Street, Westminster, London, S.W.
LUZAC & Co., 46, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.
B. QUARITCH, 11, Grafton Street, New Bond Street, London, W.
W. THACKER & Co., 2, Creed Lane, London, E.C.
OLIVER AND BOYD, Tweeddale Court, Edinburgh.
E. PONSONBY (LTD.), 116, Grafton Street, Dublin.
WHELDON & WESLEY (LTD.), 2, 3 & 4, Arthur Street, New Oxford Street, London, W.C. 2.

ON THE CONTINENT.

ERNEST LEROUX, 28, Rue Bonaparte, Paris.
FRIEDLANDER AND SOHN, Berlin.
MARTINUS NIJHOFF, The Hague, Holland.
OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, Leipzig.

University of Madras

DRAVIDIC STUDIES

I. THE DEMONSTRATIVE BASES

BY

C. P. VENKATARAMA AYYAR, M.A., L.T.

II. THE PRONOUNS AND PRONOMINAL TERMINATIONS OF THE FIRST PERSON IN DRAVIDIAN

BY

K. V. SUBBAYYA, M.A., L.T.

III. THE SANSKRITIC ELEMENT IN THE VOCABULARIES OF THE DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES

BY

S. ANAVARATAVINAYAKAM PILLAI, M.A., L.T.

MADRAS

PRINTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS

1923

PRICE, 2 *rupees* 4 *annas*

102

DRAVIDIC STUDIES
No. I.

THE DEMONSTRATIVE BASES.

RADICAL *V* IN DEMONSTRATIVES.

EVIDENCE FROM WORD-SANDHI IN TAMIL.

Sandhi.

By Sandhi we mean the changes which the initial and final sounds undergo when used in a word-group or sentence. Sandhi is of two kinds: (i) External and (ii) Internal.

2. Of these, External Sandhi relates to the changes which are the result of the combination of the final sound of one word with the initial sound of another; while Internal Sandhi refers to the changes which occur within a word itself.

3. In Mixed Sandhi in Tamil where one vowel sound comes in contact with another vowel sound or a consonant, certain important changes are observed which are very interesting.

4. These changes fall mainly under one of three heads, namely—

(i) a new sound may come in (தோன்றல்);

(ii) one sound may pass into another (திரிதல்); and

(iii) there may be loss of some sound (கெடுதல்).

The Change after Demonstratives.

5. Of these changes, the topic taken up here is the appearing of a consonantal sound in Mixed Sandhi between the vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, *e* and either a consonantal sound or the semi-vowel *y*. The changes that are observed in the above cases are as follow *:—

(i) When the next word begins with a vowel or *y*, a new consonantal sound *v* always comes in.

---

* எகர வினாமுச் சுட்டின் முன்னர், உயிரும் யகரமு மெய்தின் வவ்வும், பிறவரி னவையுந் தூக்கிற் சுட்டு, நீளின் யகரமுந் தோன்றுத னெறியே. Nannūl, rule 163.

(ii) But when the next word begins with a consonant, the initial consonant of the coming word is always doubled, e.g.—

e + kaṭal = e (k) kaṭal
a + kaṭal = a (k) kaṭal
i + kaṭal = i (k) kaṭal
u + kaṭal = u (k) kaṭal.

[*e* is the interrogative base and *a*, *i* and *u* are demonstrative bases mentioned in the rule quoted below.]

6. Similarly when a nasal consonant comes in after the interrogative and demonstrative bases mentioned above, it is also likewise doubled, e.g.—

a + malai = a (m) malai
i + malai = i (m) malai
u + malai = u (m) malai
e + malai = e (m) malai.

7. The same doubling is noticed when the next word begins with a vowel. And in such cases, the consonant *v* which appears [section 5 (i)] is doubled, e.g.—

a + aṇi = a vv aṇi
i + aṇi = i vv aṇi
u + aṇi = u vv aṇi
e + aṇi = e vv aṇi.

8. As has been said (section 5), when the next word after *a*, *i*, *u* and *e* begins with the semi-vowel *y*, the consonant *v* is said to come in to fill up the hiatus between the vowels and the semi-vowel sound *y*, e.g.—

a + yāṉai = a (v) yāṉai
i + yāṉai = i (v) yāṉai
u + yāṉai = u (v) yāṉai
e + yāṉai = e (v) yāṉai.

*Dr. Caldwell's Theory.**

9. The regularity with which these demonstratives—proximate *i*-, remote *a*-, intermediate *u*-,—and the interrogative base *e*- act in the examples quoted above, is very remarkable. On this point, Dr. Caldwell observes : " The vocalic prefixes *a*, *i*, *u* and *e* occupy one and the same position, obey one and the same law, and differ only in the particular signification which is expressed by each." It is an interesting question why these bases should behave so very regularly. Dr. Caldwell points out rightly : "It is very difficult to treat the

* Comparative Grammar, 1913, 3rd edition, page 421.

demonstrative and interrogative pronouns of the Dravidian family separately. The bases are different but they are built up on those bases in precisely the same manner and obey one and the same law, so that what is said about the one class may be regarded as said about the other also" (Comparative Grammar, 1913, 3rd edition, page 420).

10. Elsewhere in discussing the demonstrative pronouns *ivaṉ*, 'this man,' *avaṉ*, 'that man,' *uvaṉ*, 'the intermediate or medial man,' and the interrogative *evaṉ*, 'which man,' he states that the words which signify man and woman have gradually lost the definiteness of their original signification and have shrunk into the position of masculine and feminine terminations and observes further: "The suffixes or signs of gender are so closely incorporated with the demonstrative bases that *it requires some knowledge of the principles of the language* to enable us to separate them."

11. But when he attempts to settle definitely the primitive form of the demonstrative bases, he states: "The ordinary demonstratives of the Dravidian dialects are the simple short vowels *a*, *i* and *u*; and it will be found that every other form which they assume is derived from this by some euphonic process."

The Theory of Euphonic Process.

12. Assuming for argument that this is so, the suggestion of 'euphonic process' does not help us to solve the difficulty which at once presents itself, when the masculine and feminine terminations are added to the simple short vowels.

13. The rules of vowel-sandhi in Tamil and other Dravidian languages throw much light on the question. In the Dravidian languages two vowels do not generally coalesce together, but the hiatus between them is prevented by a euphonic consonant, either *v* or *y*.

14. There are, however, some examples in Telugu where sandhi does take place and a vowel is elided, e.g.—

In Telugu, *Lakṣmi* + *amma* gives *Lakṣm-amma*.

But in Tamil we should have *Lakṣmi (y) amma*.

That is to say, we should get a *y*-glide after the front vowel *i*. And not only in the case of *i* but in the case of other front vowels, *ī* and *ai*, a *y*-glide comes in quite naturally in vowel-sandhi in Tamil, e.g.—

tī + *eṭuttāṉ* = *tī-y-eṭuttāṉ*

peruntakai + *iruntāṉ* = *peruntakai (y) iruntāṉ*.

15. In Telugu also, as in Tamil, a *y*-glide comes in after long *ī* in vowel-sandhi, e.g.—

pallakī + *ekkenu* = *pallakī (y) ekkenu*.

And when we examine old Telugu we find that there is perfect agreement between Tamil and Telugu in the matter of the *y*-glide coming in after the front vowels in vowel-sandhi. The following example from the Telugu Bhāratam fully bears out the point, e.g.:—

pani + ēmi + ani gives *pani-y-ēmi-y-ani* (Bhāratam III–3, verse 267); but in modern Telugu we should have only *panēmani*.

This shows that in vowel-sandhi in Dravidian languages, whenever there is a front vowel like *i* as the final sound of one word, we should always expect to find the euphonic *y* coming in before a vowel.

Dr. Caldwell's Theory examined.

16. If, as Dr. Caldwell says, the proximate demonstrative be only the pure vowel *i*, then the addition of the terminations denoting gender as *-aṉ*, *-al* and *-ar* would produce only *iyaṉ*, *iyaḷ* and *iyar* and not, as is actually the case, *ivaṉ*, *ivaḷ* and *ivar*.

For, the euphonic consonant *v* comes in only between the back vowels of one word and other vowels in the next, as in—

viḷa + aḻakŭ = viḷa (v) aḻaku
kaṭu + aḻakŭ = kaṭu (v) aḻaku

17. Now in the case of the demonstrative pronoun *ivaṉ*, we get a *v* and not a *y* between *i* and *-aṉ*. This fact and the doubling of the initial consonants after *a-*, *i-*, *u-* and *e-*; and the appearance of a *v* before the initial *y* of the next word, which have been illustrated above (sections 5, 6, 8) have to be satisfactorily explained. Dr. Caldwell was evidently much struck with this unity of principle in these bases. For he says: * "In no other language or family of languages in the world shall we find its equal or even its second," and concludes: "The Dravidian family has retained some præ-Sanskrit elements of immense antiquity," and "in particular its demonstratives were not borrowed from Sanskrit."

18. But the main question is why these demonstrative and interrogative bases should behave in the same manner. This would be explained if Tamil grammar is read historically and the facts relating to this subject are well investigated. As Dr. Caldwell observes: "In this particular, all the dialects agree on the whole so perfectly with Tamil and with one another that it is unnecessary to multiply examples." And as Tamil forms agree with the forms in other languages of the family, Tamil may throw much light on the question.

---

* Comparative Grammar, 1913, 3rd edition, page 422.

Illustrations from the Old Classics.

19. The Tamil literary dialect of the ancient classics furnishes many illustrations which go to show that the demonstrative and interrogative bases are not merely the simple vowels *a*, *i*, *u* and *e*, as Dr. Caldwell says, but that they are *av*, *iv*, *uv* and *ev*.

A. These forms are fairly common in the classics. The demonstrative base *uv* (உவ்) is used to denote the intermediate object or more particularly the object behind or beyond, e.g.—

(i) உவக்காண் எங்காதலர் செல்வர் இவக்காண்
என்மேனிபசப்பூர்வது (Kuṟaḷ 1185).

(ii) வருந்துநோய்தணியவிருந்தனர் உப்பால் (Cilappatikāram XII, line 5, p. 286).

(iii) ஊழையும் உப்பக்கம் காண்பர் உலைவின்றித் தாழாது
ஞற்றுபவர் (Kuṟaḷ 620).

(iv) உப்பால் உயர்ந்த வுலகம்புகும் (Nāṉmaṇikkaṭikai, v. 29).

(v) உப்பாலிடங்கொள் பேரண்டம் (Old Tiruviḷaiyāṭal, ch. 36, v. 26).

(vi) உவனாய் நின்றான் (Periyāḻvār Tirumoḻi I-3, v. 5).

(vii) மொய்யானதில்லா முடவனொருவன்றனது
கையானவையிரண்டுங்கந்தாத்தவழ்தருவால்
ஐடாவதற்குமோரரும்பிணியொன்றெய்தியக்கால்
உய்யானே யானும் உவன்போற்றளர்வேனோ
(Kantapurāṇam, Mārkaṇṭēya, v. 18).

(viii) அவ் வெள்ளருவி உவ்வரையதுவே (Patiṟṟuppattu, v. 78).

B. The proximate demonstrative (இவ்) *iv* is likewise much used--

(i) இவ்வே பீலியணிந்து மாலைசூட்டி (Puṟanāṉūṟu, v. 95).

(ii) இவ்வென வுரைத்துமென்று (Cintāmaṇi, v. 2762).

(iii) இவ்விருந்தான் (Cintāmaṇi, v. 1790).

C. The form *av* (அவ்) for the remote demonstrative is also freely used—

அவ்வே, இவ்வென வறிதற்கு மெய்பெறக் கிளப்ப (Rule 121, Collatikāram, Tolkāppiyam).

The Tolkāppiyam.

20. In the old grammar in Tamil, known as the *Tolkāppiyam*, the grammarian discusses which sounds occur as final sounds in Tamil. With regard to the final consonant *v* he has a rule—

"வகரக் கிளவி நான்மொழி யீற்றது" (Rule 81, Eḻuttatikāram).

The rule says that there are only four words in Tamil where the consonant *v* is final. These, the commentator tells us, are *av*, *iv*, *uv* and *tev*. And it is this permitted final *v* which makes its appearance in vowel-sandhi (sections 7, 8).

Av, iv *in Tamil Prose.*

21. That the expressions *av* and *iv* were so used extensively is further clearly seen from the old prose writings also. In his prose commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam* the commentator *Naccinārkiṉiyar* writes *av* and *iv* to denote 'that' and 'this' respectively, e.g.—

(i) அவ் இன்சாரியை ஈறு திரியுமாறு கூறுகின்றது
(Rule 121, Eḻuttatikāram, Tolkāppiyam, p. 86).

(ii) அவ் உண்டென்னுஞ் சொல் பண்பை புணர்த்துங்கால்
(Rule 222, Collatikāram, Tolkāppiyam, p. 143).

(iii) இவ் ஈற்று நாட் பெயர்
(Rule 331, Eḻuttatikāram, Tolkāppiyam, p. 204).

An additional confirmatory evidence of the wide use of forms like (இவ்) *iv* in ancient Tamil prose is furnished by the form found in an ancient Tamil Inscription (A.D. 1000), e.g.—

இவ் ஊரும் பணையமாய் *

The v *is not a glide.*

22. In the Naṉṉūl which was written some centuries after the date of the Tolkāppiyam, the grammarian says that a *v* comes in between *a-*, *i-*, *u-*, and *e-* and the initial vowel of the next word (page 1, footnote). The commentator of this rule observes that this *v* which makes its appearance in vowel-sandhi is not a glide.† This observation of the ancient commentator clears the doubt which may arise whether the *v* between *a-* and *-an* in the word *avaṉ* is radical or only a glide-sound coming in to prevent the hiatus between the vowels.

Other evidence.

23. The changes which take place in sandhi when a word beginning in *y* or *v* comes after the demonstratives *a-*, *i-*, *u-*, are given by Tolkāppiyar in rule 206, Eḻuttatikāram of the Tolkāppiyam. The rule says: "யவமுன் வரினே வகரமொற்றாம்,"

---

* Travancore Archæological Series, Volume II, Part I, page 39, line 17.

† யகரமுமெய்தில் வவ்வும் என்றமையின் இங்ஙனந் தோன்றிய வகர யகரங்கள் உடம்படு மெய்யல்ல வென்பதூஉம் பெற்றாம் (Commentary on rule 163 of the Naṉṉūl).

i.e., if a word beginning in *y* or *v* comes after *a-*, *i-*, *u-*, the consonant *v* appears between them.

For example, *a* + *yāḷi* = *avyāḷi.*
a + *va ḷai* = *avvaḷai.*

This is very important as it implies the existence of a consonant *v* after *a*, etc. Its appearance in this case is in the nature of a survival of an original consonant.

In the next rule (rule 207 of Eḻuttatikāram, Tolkāppiyam), Tolkāppiyar dwells upon the changes which occur in sandhi when instead of *y* or *v*, a vowel begins the word which comes after *a-*, *i-*, *u-*. And this rule 'உயிர்முன்வரினு மாயியறிரியாது' is particularly interesting. The commentator says that the *v* which appears in sandhi after *a-*, *i-*, *u-* (according to the previous rule) would, in this case, be always doubled. And the only exception, where the *v* is lost, is where the demonstrative base is lengthened. (Commentary on rule 207 quoted above.)

The *v* after *a*, *i*, *u* is known as 'the demonstrative *v*' ('சுட்டு முதல்வகரம்': rule 183, Eḻuttatikāram, Tolkāppiyam; and 'சுட்டு வகரம்': rule 235, Nannūl); and as 'the demonstratives which have the *v* as the final sound' ('வவ்விறு சுட்டு': rule 250, Nannūl) as distinguished from the final sound *v* in the word *tev* (cf. 'ஏனைவகரம்,' i.e., 'the other *v*' as distinguished from the 'demonstrative *v*' in the rule 'ஏனை வகரம் இன்னொடுசிவணும்') (Rule 184, Eḻuttatikāram, Tolkāppiyam).

24. In the Tolkāppiyam, the changes which take place in sandhi after the demonstratives are treated separately and a special rule (rule 184 of Eḻuttatikāram) has reference solely to the other word *tev*. Similarly the author of the Nannūl has a separate rule relating to the sandhi of the word *tev* with other words. The rule is—

'தெவ்வென் மொழியே தொழிற் பெயரற்றே
மவ்வரின் வஃகான் மவ்வுமாகும்' (Rule 236, Nannūl).

The rule quoted above states that when the word *tev* is combined with other words, a full *u* should appear after the final *v*. Thus—

tev+*katitu* would give *tev* + *u* + *kaṭitu*.

Then the *v* is doubled before *u* and we get *tev*+*v*+*u*+*k*-*kaṭitu* (தெவ்வுக்கடிது).

25. But if instead of a vowel or a stop consonant, the nasal consonant *m* begins the next word after *tev*, the final *v* in *tev*

would become assimilated to the initial *m* in the coming word as in—

tev + *matankiya* which gives *tem-matankiya*.*

These facts show that the vowel *u* which comes after *tev* is in the nature of a union-vowel or insertion between root and another word. The round vowel *u* comes in on account of the *v* in *tev*. And as Tolkāppiyar includes this word in the category of words with permissible final *v* in Tamil, † the actual presence of *v* in the demonstratives is clearly proved.

Av, iv *in Tamil Poetry*.

26. Another important fact which is sometimes noticed is the change of the demonstrative *av* into *ā* (ஆ) in Tamil poetry. There are some very striking examples in the ancient classics where the commentator invites our special attention to such a change. In the line 'ஆயிடைமணந்தபந்தர்' (Patirruppattu, verse 51) the commentator states that the demonstrative base *av* was changed into long *ā*.‡ Here, the radical *v* is lost as the demonstrative base is lengthened (vide section 23).

The substitution of *ā* for *av* is possible in poetry because both have the same quantity. There are numerous examples in later literature as well.§ And the grammarian Tolkāppiyar also uses the form *ā* for *av* in some of the rules in the Tolkāppiyam.||

27. In this connexion it is interesting to note that in Kurukh there is a remote demonstrative *ā* and a proximate demonstrative *ī*, e.g. ¶—

ā ālasin = that man.
ī mukkan = this woman.

---

* தெம்மடங்கிய சேணிலங்கேகயர்
தம்மடங்கலைத்தடன் நம்பியதாமென
மும்மடங்கு பொலிக்க முகத்தினன்
வெம்மடங்கலைப் புன்னி வெதும்புவான் (Kampa-Rāmāyaṇam, Suntarakāntam Kāṭcip-paṭalam, verse 19).

† Rule 81, Eluttatikāram, Tolkāppiyam, section 20.

‡ அவ்வென்னும் சுட்டுமுதல்வகார வீற்றுப்பெயர் ஆயிடையென முடிந்தது (Patirruppattu, page 82, line 7).

§ (1) ஆயிடைக் கவிகளோடு மங்கதன் முதலினோர்
(சுந்தர--திருவடி தொழுத-84)

(2) ஆயிடை புரையிழந்தழகன் றேவியும்
(சுந்தர—காட்சி-61)

From the Tolkāppiyam.

|| (i) ஆயேம் சொல்லும அசைநிலைக்கிளவி
(அவ் + எம் = ஆயேம்)

(Rule 281, Collatikāram, Tolkāppiyam).

(ii) கெடவரல் பண்ணை யாயிரண்டும் விளையாட்டு (அவ்இரண்டும்).

(Rule 319, Collatikāram, Tolkāppiyam).

¶ Kurukh Grammar by Rev. Ferd. Hahn (1900), page 20, section 23.

And in Tulu the word *avu* is a demonstrative pronoun meaning 'it' or 'that'; and *avvē* is emphatic (= 'just that').

Conclusion.

28. Thus the loss of *v* in the initial lengthening of the demonstrative base in poetry; the use of the forms in literature and in the rules and in the commentaries on grammar; and the survival of *v* in mixed sandhi strongly indicate that the old demonstrative bases were *av*, *iv* and *uv*.

And the reason why these bases behave in the same manner is then easily intelligible.

Another important point is the doubling of the consonants after *a*, *i*, *u*, which is due to the presence of *v* in the bases *av*, *iv*, *uv*, where the *v* has been lost for a long time.

And similarly the doubling of *v* after *a*, *i*, *u* and before other vowels is also quite regular since the original bases are *av*, *iv* and *uv*. For, in pronouncing *av* the stress is thrown upon *v* and in passing from the strongly pronounced *v* to the vowel of the next word the consonantal glide *v* is inevitable. Hence we get the doubling of *v* in these cases as in the compound word *a(v)+aruvi* which gives *av-v-aruvi*.

Finally, the appearance of the consonant *v* before words beginning in *y* is but the survival of the lost consonant in these demonstrative bases.

29. Dr. Caldwell characterizes this regularity of principle as 'the beautiful and philosophical regularity of this quadruple set of remote, proximate and intermediate demonstratives and interrogatives' (page 422). But when once it is realized that the old forms were *av*, *iv*, *uv* and *ev*, as Tamil grammar treated historically and illustrated by examples from Tamil classics proves so clearly, the solution is easy. Dr. Caldwell was labouring under a misapprehension that the bases were pure vowels. It was because he started with this idea that the ordinary demonstratives of the Dravidian dialects are the simple short vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, that he was not able to satisfactorily explain the changes above referred to. And that he himself was not absolutely certain about this suggestion is clear from an observation which he has made elsewhere: "It requires some knowledge of the principles of the language to enable us to separate them."

30. The principles of the language could be well estimated only by a study of the forms of words in the literary dialect of the more ancient classics—which were probably not consulted by Dr. Caldwell—and by the comparative and historical study of Tamil grammar. When this is done we find that *avaṉ*, *ivaṉ*, and *uvaṉ* are perfectly regular forms as they arise from *av*, *iv* and *uv* and not from *a*, *i* and *u*.

C. P. VENKATARAMA AYYAR.

Tamil Books referred to.

(1) Kuṟal.
(2) Cilappatikāram.
(3) Nāṉmaṇikkaṭikai.
(4) Patiṟṟuppaṭṭu.
(5) Puṟanāṉūṟu.
(6) Cintāmani.
(7) Kampa-Rāmāyaṇam.
(8) Kantapurāṇam.
(9) Paḷaiya (old) Tiruviḷaiyāṭal.
(10) Periyāḷvār Tirumoḷi.
(11) Tolkāppiyam : Eḷuttatikāram and Collatikāram.
(12) Naṉṉūl and Commentary.

REMARKS.

Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar in his article on the Demonstrative and Interrogative bases in Dravidian has followed up a suggestion of mine, testing it by means of the early literature and the older grammarians, and arriving at the conclusion that the suggestion is borne out by the facts which these present. He has confined himself mainly to the data derivable from Tamil and, to a less extent, Telugu, but I think what he has said is sufficient not only to warrant the conclusion that these bases in Tamil are to be regarded as *av-*, *iv-*, *ev-*, rather than *a-*, *i-*, *e-*, but that *av-*, *iv-*, *ev-* are the pan-Dravidic forms.

No phonetician could readily rest content with the explanation usually given of such forms as Tamil *ivaṉ*, 'this man,' *avyāṉai*, 'that elephant,' namely that they are made up respectively of the demonstrative particle *i-* plus the termination *-aṉ*, and the demonstrative particle *a-* plus the noun *yāṉai*. To call the *v* of *ivaṉ* and *avyāṉai* a glide, as is sometimes done, is to pay too little regard to the nature of a glide as a transition-sound the character of which is strictly conditioned by the sounds from which and to which the transit is made. In the case of vowel-glides, with which we are here chiefly concerned, the main determining factor is the vowel that precedes. If this is palatal *(i, e)*, the glide is palatal, viz., *i̯*, or unsyllabic *i*; if it is labial *(o, u)*, the glide is labial, viz., *u̯*, or unsyllabic *u*. These transition-sounds are often not graphically expressed, but they exist nevertheless, and cannot but exist, in normal speech. In Latin *eam*, 'her,' was pronounced *ei̯am*; compare Gothic *ija*, which is the equivalent of Latin *eam* : both represent an Indo-germanic *ei̯-ām*. Similarly Latin *duō*, 'two' was pronounced

duu̯ō; compare the dissyllabic pronunciation of Vedic *dvā* = *du̯ā*. So in English: unless we deliberately pause after the first word, 'who are,' 'we are' must inevitably be pronounced with the glides *u̯* and *i̯* respectively. This phenomenon does not belong to any particular language or group of languages: it is a phonetic law, a natural law which, within its proper sphere, operates with the regularity of any other natural law. This being so, if the particle *i-* is to be compounded with *-aṉ*, we should expect *iyaṉ* as the result; just as from *paṇi*+*al*, we have *paṇi-y-al*, 'worship,' or from *maṇi*+*aṭikka*, *maṇi-y-aṭikka*, 'to strike a bell,' where *y* correctly represents the glide: and only if it could be shown that அ has, or even had at one time an *o*-tonality could the *v* of *avyāṉai* receive any justification as a glide. But, even if that were possible, what are we to say to *ivyāṉai*, 'this elephant,' where the *v* stands between two palatal sounds? The glide-theory fails as a principle of interpretation for these forms. Only in the case of the demonstrative particle seen in *uvaṉ*, 'that (intermediate) man,' could the *v* be reasonably explained on this principle, namely, as an off-glide.

The problem of vowel-glides in Dravidian—a very important problem—is made more complex by a peculiarity in the pronunciation of vowels, not unnaturally more apparent to a stranger than to the speakers themselves. One finds what may be regarded, in a way, as the opposite of the phenomena of vowel-glides. As after a palatal vowel the glide *i̯* is heard and after a labial vowel the glide *u̯*, similarly before a palatal vowel, at least at the beginning of a word, the sound *i̯* is heard and before a labial vowel the sound *u̯*. Just as the ordinary vowel-glides are frequently unexpressed (in Greek and Latin, for example) so *these* sounds receive as a rule no expression in the written language. The former are called 'off-glides.' It will cause no confusion, I think, if for our present purpose we call the latter 'on-glides,' always remembering that the phonetician (usually) employs this word in a somewhat different sense. In such cases as Tamil *vaṇḍi-y-illai*, 'there is no carriage,' Telugu *pō-v-unu*, 'he would go,' etc., *y* and *v* might conceivably be regarded as either off-glides or on-glides, since they stand between two palatal and two labial sounds respectively. The on-glide is clearly present in Telugu *ā-yenu*, 'he became,' *a-vunu*, 'he would become,' etc., the off-glide as clearly in Tamil *muniy-ōṭu*, 'with the sage,' *aduv-ē* 'that indeed.' On the whole the on-glides seem to prevail in internal sandhi (therefore Telugu *pō-vunu* probably, as *pō-yenu*, 'he went'); the off-glides in external sandhi (therefore probably Tamil *vaṇḍiy-illai*, as *vaṇḍiy-alla*,

'it is not a carriage'). No doubt there are many apparent exceptions; but this only makes the problem all the more interesting.

That these pronominal bases are *av-*, *iv-*, *ev-* receives corroboration from the doubling of an initial consonant when these bases are prefixed, a fact which Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar—who is mainly concerned with ancient testimony—has not dwelt upon. Such forms as *akkaṭal*, 'that sea,' etc., can be readily interpreted as arising from *av+kaṭal*, etc. A parallel instance, or at least a striking illustration of a double consonant arising in this way, is afforded by Hebrew. In Hebrew, when the article *ha-* is attached to a noun beginning with a consonant, this consonant must be doubled whenever such doubling is phonetically admissible. The reason for this doubling is made clear by a reference to the cognate languages. In Arabic, for instance, the article is *al*. The final *l*, there can be little doubt, was originally present in the Hebrew article; and it is to this original presence that the doubling of a following consonant is due. As in Hebrew the original *l* of the article in combination, let us say, with an initial *k* of the following noun produced by assimilation *kk* (the consonant proper to the noun being thus preserved), so, for example, in Tamil the original *v* of these bases, in combination with an initial *k* of the noun to which they were prefixed, produced by assimilation *kk*. The doubling of a following consonant became then the traditional characteristic of the article in Hebrew and of these pronominal prefixes (regarded now as *a-*, *i-*, *e-*) in Tamil, and its necessity was in both cases embodied in a grammatical rule.

I may add that I do not at all think that this is the only instance of such assimilation in Tamil. Indeed, I feel that we may find an exact parallel to the above assimilation of *v-k* to *k-k* in the formation of the plural of a certain class of nouns. All nouns that end in the accusative singular in *-vai*, i.e., all nouns which in the corresponding Malayāḷam form have in the nominative singular a final *-vŭ*, form their plural in *-kkaḷ*; for example, *āṉmākkaḷ*) 'souls.' Here, it seems to me, an original *āṉmāv-kaḷ* (cf. the accusative singular *āṉmāv-ai* and Malayāḷam nominative singular *ātmāvu*) is related to *āṉmākkaḷ* exactly as an original *av-kaṭal* is to *akkaṭal*.

What has been said of *v-k* would naturally apply equally to *v-t*, or to *v* in combination with any other consonant.

If this is so, if these pronominal bases are to be regarded as *av-*, *iv-*, *ev-*, we should expect to find these forms when they are prefixed to words beginning with a vowel. This is, of course, not so: the *v* is in this case doubled; *av+iṭam* becomes *avviṭam*, 'that place,' *av+āṭu* becomes *avvāṭu*, 'that sheep,' etc. I

would suggest that this doubling when a vowel follows may be due to the influence of the far greater number of instances in which the doubling is due to a following consonant. There may have been other causes at work. I will only point out that the genius of Tamil is not averse to a single consonant following a short vowel at the beginning of a word, as is evidenced not only by such words as *ilai*, 'leaf,' *talai*, 'head,' *malai*, 'mountain,' and a host of others, but also by such primitive combinations as *nil-am*, 'ground,' *nal-am*, 'goodness,' *eṉ-a* = Sanskrit *iti* (by the side of *eṉṉa*, 'to say'), *paṭa*, 'to suffer'; *cey-al*, 'agency' (by the side of *ceyyal*, 'to do'). And especially I would call attention to the contrast between Tamil *avviṭam*, 'that place,' *ivviṭam*, 'this place,' and the isolated forms *aviḍam*, '(in) that place, there,' *ividam*, '(in) this place, here,' in Malayāḷam, a language which so frequently seems to reflect an earlier stage of Tamil, or at least to throw light upon such an earlier stage. Such facts require explanation and must be taken into account when the phonetic modifications of these pronominal bases are being dealt with.

Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar calls attention to the use of *ā* as a substitute for *av-* in early Tamil poetry. It is also found, together with the corresponding *ī* for *iv-*, *ē* for *ev-*, in Malayāḷam, Telugu and Kanarese. This *ā* would appear to be due, directly or indirectly, to the transference of the length of the double consonant to the preceding vowel. In Telugu there are clear traces of such exchange of quantity where the consonant is *v* or *y*; for example, literary Telugu *ēvāni*, 'whose,' by the side of *evvāni*, *āyadi*, 'she, it,' by the side of *ayyadi* (Arden's Progressive Grammar, pages 323, 324). If we might look upon such instances—and many more could be added—as the survival of a previously predominating characteristic, if we could assume, in accordance with such a principle, that there once existed in Telugu side by side pairs like, for example, *avvrāyi* and *āvrāyi*, 'that line' the existence of the latter form as *ā vrāyi* in present-day Telugu, and the contrast which this form offers to the present-day Tamil *avvarai*, 'that limit' would become more intelligible. There is little trace of such a principle in Tamil as it is written to-day. But since these pronominal affixes are so evidently identical throughout the Dravidian group, and since we find *ā* by the side of *av-* in early Tamil literature, and, moreover, since we find *ā* as the regular form in Malayāḷam, the sister dialect of Tamil, I cannot resist the conclusion that the principle disclosed in such pairs as *ēvāni*, *evvāni* was at an early period of very wide prevalence; and as I have suggested that it may account for the difference in the demonstrative element between Tamil *avvarai* and Telugu *ā vrāyi*, so I would suggest that it is also accountable for the difference between Tamil *avvarai*

and Malayāḷam *ā vara*, 'that line.' Of the two phonetic variants Tamil has fixed upon the one, viz., *av-* (and similarly *iv-*, *ev-*), Malayālam upon the other, viz., *ā* (and similarly *ī*, *ē*).

This is by no means the whole story, but I think I have said enough to indicate what I feel to be the lines along which these bases have developed. There is need for much further investigation.

M. COLLINS.

The University of Madras.

DRAVIDIC STUDIES
No. II

SECTION I.

THE HISTORY OF THE FIRST PERSONAL PRONOUN IN THE VARIOUS DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES.

TAMIL.

[*References*—

(1) Tolkāppiyam.	Peyariyal, sūtra 164. Urupial, sūtras 188 and 192. Viṉaiyiyal, sūtras 204 and 205.
(2) Vīracōḻiyam ...	Kriyā, sūtras 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.
(3) Naṉṉūl ...	Peyariyal, sūtras 285 and 294. Viṉaiyiyal, sūtras 331 and 33.]

The Nominative First Personal Pronoun.

According to the Tolkāppiyam, the oldest Tamil grammar, *yāṉ* is the first person singular, and *yām* and *nām* are the first person plurals. There is no mention in the Tolkāppiyam of *nāṉ* as the first person singular.

Nāṉ appears for the first time in the literature of the eighth or ninth century. It is found most commonly in the writings of the Śaiva and the Vaiṣṇava saints who mostly adopted the words of popular speech in their writings. In the Tiruvācakam it is the common first personal singular form. In the Vīracōḻiyam, Vēṟṟumaippaṭalam, stanza 9, and also in the Naṉṉūl, sūtra 283, *nāṉ* is mentioned as a first personal singular pronoun. The mention of *nām* (the plural of *nāṉ*) in the Tolkāppiyam and the late appearance of *nāṉ* as its singular—in the eighth or ninth century literature and later—make us conclude that even *nāṉ* was current in popular speech long before it became literary.

The double plurals *nāṅkaḷ* and *yāṅkaḷ* are found as early as the Cīvakacintāmaṇi period (vide stanzas 1763 and 1793). In the Naṉṉūl there is, however, no mention of these double plurals.

Thus: Old Tamil has *yāṉ* for the singular and *yām* and *nām* for the plural. Mid. Tamil has *yāṉ* and *nāṉ* for the singular and *yām* and *nām* for the plural. Modern Tamil recognizes only *nāṉ* as its singular and *nām* and *nāṅkaḷ* as its plurals.

N.B.—In all periods of Tamil literature poets had the licence of using even obsolete forms of words: e.g., in some of the Modern Tamil publications we find *yāṉ* and *yām* used as the first person singular and plural, respectively.

The Oblique Base.

The Tolkāppiyam, Urupial, sūtras 188 and 192, gives *eṉ*- as the oblique of *yāṉ*, *em*- as the oblique of *yām*, and *nam*- as the oblique of *nām*. This is confirmed by the Vīracōḻiyam, Vēṟṟumaippaṭalam, sūtra 7. In the Naṉṉūl, sūtra 249, the same forms are given; but it is also stated in sūtra 294 that *nāṉ* is only nominative and has no oblique base. The oblique forms recognized by grammars are (1) *eṉ*- (singular), (2) *em*- and *nam*- (plurals).

The oblique base *eṇkaḷ*- is modern.

The Verbal Suffixes.

The Tolkāppiyam (Old Tamil)—
First person singular: *-eṉ*, *-ēṉ*, *-al*.
Do. plural: *-em*, *-ēm*, *-am*, *-ām*.

N.B.— *-al* is used only in the future.

The Vīracōḻiyam (Mid. Tamil)—
First person singular: *-ēṉ*.
Do. plural: *-ēm*, *-ōm*.

N.B.—In the future tense *-eṉ* also is used (Vīracōḻiyam, Kriyā, sūtra 8). *-aṉ* and *-al* are also used only in the future tense.

The Naṉṉūl (New Tamil)—
First person singular: *-eṉ*, *-ēṉ*, *-aṉ*, *-al*.
Do. plural: *-em*, *-ēm*, *-am*, *-ām*, *-ōm*.

In Modern Tamil *-ēṉ* (singular) and *-ōm* (plural) are the only terminations that are in actual use. The rest are archaic. The Naṉṉūl evidently mixes up archaic and current forms.

To sum up—

(1) *-ēṉ* is one of the old verbal suffixes and is the standard first person singular verbal suffix in Modern Tamil.

(2) *-ōm* is found only in Mid. Tamil and Modern Tamil and is the standard first person plural in New Tamil.

(3) *-eṉ*, *-al*, *-aṉ* first person singular suffixes are old. *-aṉ* is found in Mid. Tamil. All these are archaic in Modern Tamil.

(4) *-aṉ* and *-al* are found mostly in the future tense of verbs.

(5) *-eṉ* is not found in modern literature. 'யானு நின்றனென்' (Rāmāyaṇam, paḷḷi, 72) is a rare use. But in the spoken dialect it is very commonly found when the stress is thrown on the base and not on the termination: e.g.—

(i) *Nāṉ vantḗṉ*, 'I came'; but (ii) *Nāṉ vánteṉ.*

Note on the Inclusive and Exclusive First Personal Pronouns.

In the commentaries written on the sūtras of the Tolkāppiyam and in the Naṉṉūl, we find that a differentiation is made in the function of the different first personal plural pronouns. *Nām* is regarded by the commentators of the Tolkāppiyam as an 'inclusive' pronoun, that is, as including the persons spoken to. The verbal suffixes that correspond to this pronoun are *-am* and *-ām*. *Yām* is considered as an 'exclusive' pronoun, that is to say, it does not include the person or persons spoken to. The verbal suffixes that correspond to this pronoun are *-em* and *-ēm*. The author of the Naṉṉūl includes in this class the Mid. and New Tamil suffix *-ōm*.

To sum up—

Nām, *-am* and *-ām* are inclusive, and *yām*, *-em*, *-ēm* and *-ōm* are exclusive.

This distinction, however, is not found in the text of the Tolkāppiyam. In the Vīracōḻiyam too there is no reference at all to it. Further, a close study of the Tirukkuṟaḷ, the oldest of the published Tamil literary works, shows that such a distinction was not existent in the time of Tiruvaḷḷuvar: e.g., beside *yām iṉṉam* (790) and *yām uḍaiyam* (844) we have *yām iruntēm* (1312) and *yām uḷēm* (1204). Thus with *yām* are used both *-am* and *-ēm*. Again, *kātalam* (1314) is paraphrased as *kātalai uṭaiyēm* by Parimēlaḻakar. Similarly *piṟiyalam* = *piṟiyēm* (1315) *eṉṉuvam* = *eṇṇakkaṭavēm* (467). *Yām* occurs in the Kuṟaḷ fifteen times, but *nām* only once.

This distinction is found for the first time in the Naṉṉūl; and in the grammatical notes of the commentators of the Tolkāppiyam. It does not seem at any time to have been observed very strictly.

Further a comparative study of the other Dravidian languages shows that Kanarese, Gōṇḍī and Brāhūī possess only one form for 'we.'

Hence it seems reasonable to infer that in Primitive Dravidian this distinction was not at all existent. Doctor Grierson says: "From these facts it seems necessary to infer that the original Dravidian language had not developed a double plural of this pronoun . . . The use of the double

plural can accordingly be due to a tendency which has been adopted from a different family, and if that be the case, we can only think of the Muṇḍā languages, where there is a similar set of dual and plural forms of the personal pronoun of the first person " (Linguistic Survey, IV, pages 293 and 294).

While, therefore, it seems to be certain that Primitive Dravidian had no such distinction as that between 'inclusive' and 'exclusive', it must nevertheless remain for the present a puzzle how it was that an uncultivated foreign dialect like the Muṇḍā was able to influence a highly cultivated language like Tamil or Telugu.

MALAYĀḶAM.

[*References*—

(1) Kēraḷa-Pāṇinīyam, sūtras 109, 239 and 240.

(2) Gundert's catechism of Malayāḷam Grammar, articles 87, 88 and 126.

(3) Gundert's Malayāḷam Grammar (second edition, 1868), articles 120, 121, 197 to 208.

(4) L. J. Frohnmeyer's Malayāḷam Grammar, article 56, pages 254 and 287.

(5) Seshagiri Prabhu's Vyākaraṇa-mitran, article 134.]

The Nominative First Personal Pronoun.

Malayāḷam has for the first person singular *ñān* [ɲæ̃:n]. This form is not found in any other language. Doctor Gundert (in article 121 in his bigger Grammar of the Malayāḷam language) says that *yān* is found in Rāmacaritram, 51.

The plurals of *ñān* are—

(1) *Nām* [n:˜m] and *nōm*, (2) *nammaḷ*, (3) *ñāṅṅaḷ* [ɲæ̃:ŋŋᵊḷ], *ñaṅṅaḷ* and *eṅṅaḷ*.

Of these plurals *ñāṅṅaḷ*, *ñaṅṅaḷ* and *eṅṅaḷ* are double plural forms, formed by the addition of the neuter plural suffix *kaḷ* to the pronominal plural suffix *m*; cf. Tamil *nāṅkaḷ* = *nām* + *kaḷ*. *m* + *k* > *ṅk* in Tamil and *ṅṅ* in Malayālam (vide my thesis on Nasal plus Consonant). There is a difference in the function of *nām* and *ñāṅṅaḷ*; *nām* is an 'inclusive' pronoun, that is to say, it includes the party spoken to, while *ñāṅṅaḷ* excludes them.

Nām is more literary than *nōm*, *nammaḷ* and *eṅṅaḷ* are considered colloquial.

Ñāṅṅaḷ is an old honorific plural (vide Gundert's Malayāḷam Dictionary, page 411). *Nām* and *nōm* are also used as honorific plurals.

The common first person plural *ñaṅṅaḷ* and the vulgar *eṅṅaḷ* and also *nammaḷ* have the base vowel short through the influence of oblique forms (cf. Tuḷu *nama* and *yeṅkuḷu*).

The Oblique Base.

First person singular : *en-*.
Do. plural : *nam-* and *ñaṅṅaḷ-*.

The Verbal Pronominal Suffixes.

Malayāḷam verbs represent the oldest stage of development of the Dravidian verb, a stage when the participles were themselves used as finite verbs without any distinction of person or number. In Old Tamil, we find a similar state of affairs.

In Old Malayāḷam poetry, however, we find often the pronominal suffixes used: *-ēn* is the singular first person suffix, and *-ōm* is the plural suffix. *-an* is the first person singular suffix in the case of future verbs (vide Seshagiri Prabhu's Vyākaraṇa-mitran, article 134).

KANARESE.

[*References—*

(1) Karnāṭaka-bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇam, sūtras 92 to 94.
(2) Śabdānuśāsana, 287, 288, 442 and 443.
(3) Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa, 146, 147 and 217.
(4) Kittel's Grammar of the Kannaḍa Language, pages 74, 75 and 76.]

The oldest form of the first person singular in Kanarese is *ān* and that of the plural is *ām*. The sūtra 92 in the Karnāṭaka-Bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇam and the sūtra 288 in the Śabdānuśāsana give only *ān* and *ām* as the singular and plural forms. But in the commentary to sūtra 288 in the Śabdānuśāsana it is mentioned that *nānu*, *nāmu* and the oblique *nan-* and *nam-* are also found in ancient poets. According to Kittel, the plural *nāvu* < *nāmu* is the first to appear and is found in a Śāsana of A.D. 1181. The form *nānu* is found in the Mid. Kanarese period, that is to say, after the twelfth century. From these it seems to be clear that *ān* and *ām* were the oldest forms in Kanarese and *nānu* and *nāmu* (> *nāvu*) which were originally only popular forms gradually came to replace *ān* and *ām* from the twelfth century onwards.

The double plural *āmgaḷ* is also found in the Old Kanarese dialect. Very likely it is a late form in Old Kanarese as it is not referred to in the Karnāṭaka-bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇam and the Śabdānuśāsana and also it may have been looked upon only

as a popular form. It is mentioned only in the Mūḍabidaru manuscript of Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa. We have no traces of it anywhere else.

The change of *m* into *v* in *āmu* and *nāmu* is a characteristic feature of Kanarese. Cf. *nimu* > *nivu* (you), *tāmu* > *tāvu* (themselves) (vide Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa, article 104).

The Oblique Base.

The first person singular oblique in Old and Mid. Kanarese is *en-*, and its plural is *em-*.

In New Kanarese we find *nan-* as the singular, and *nam-* as its plural.

The Verbal Suffixes.

	First person.	
	Singular.	Plural.
Old Kanarese ...	*-en*	*-em*
Mid. Kanarese ...	*-en, -enu, -e*	*-evu*
New Kanarese ...	*-enu, -e, -ēnu*	*-evu, -ivi, -ēvi*

N.B.—(1) In Old Kanarese singular *-en* is written *-en* before vowels and *-em* otherwise.

(2) In Old Kanarese, the plural *-em* is *-ĕm* if not followed by a vowel; otherwise it is *-evu*, *m* > *v*.

(3) The forms *-ēnu*, *-ēne*, *-ēvu*, *-ēve* are emphatic Modern Kanarese forms.

TULU.

[*References*—

(1) Brigel's Grammar of the Tuḷu Language, pages 33-39 and 45 to 110.

(2) Manner's Tuḷu-English Dictionary.]

Tuḷu has *yānu* to denote the first person singular; cf. this with Tamil *yāṉ*. The plural of *yānu* is *yeṅkuḷu*. There is also another plural *nama*.

Both *yeṅkuḷu* and *nama* are derived from the oblique base *yem-* and *nam-*. Hence the base-vowels of *yeṅkuḷu* and *nama* are short. *yeṅkuḷu* is a double plural in form, *-kuḷu* being added to the plural base *yem-*.

The plural *nama* has an inclusive meaning while *yeṅkuḷu* has an exclusive meaning.

The influence of the oblique base on the nominative form is seen in the plural of the second person and the reflexive pronoun. We have in Tuḷu *nīkuḷu* beside *niṅkaḷ* in Tamil (= you); *tanukuḷu* (themselves) in Tuḷu beside *tāṅkal* in Tamil.

The Oblique Base.

The first person singular oblique base in Tuḷu is *yen-*, and its plurals are *eṅkuḷ-* and *nam-*.

The Verbal Suffixes.

The singular first person suffix is *-e* and the plural is *-a*.
[The *e* of the first person singular is pronounced as [æ] (vide Brigel's Grammar of the Tuḷu Language, page 47).]

TELUGU.

[*References*—
(1) Arden's Telugu Grammar, sections 168, 172, 177, 181 to 201 and 772.
(2) Bālavyākaraṇamu, section 24, pages 59 and 60.]

The forms of the first person found in the Telugu Bhāratam are :—*ēnu* and *nēnu*, singulars, and *ēmu*, *nēmu* and *mēmu* and also *manamu* plurals. Of these the modern forms are :—*nēnu* singular and *mēmu* and *manamu* plurals.

In the Mahā-Bhāratam the common first person plural form is *ēmu*. *Nēmu* is next in order of frequency. *Mēmu* is a rare form in the Bhāratam. *Manamu* too is found in the Bhāratam, but it has a meaning different from that of *ēmu* or *nēmu*. It is an inclusive plural form.

In Modern Telugu too this difference is observed. *Mēmu* excludes and *manamu* includes the persons addressed.

[*Mēmu* < *nēmu* by complete assimilation of the initial *n* to the final nasal *m*.]

Manamu is very likely a confusion of two forms. *Ma-* and *nam-*, both oblique forms. *Ma-* is from *mā-*, and *nam-* is the oblique of *nām*.

The Oblique Base (Arden, page 323*).*

The first person singular has two oblique bases, (1) *nā-* which is the base for all cases except the accusative, (2) *nan-*, the oblique of the accusative case.

Similarly, in the plural we have two bases, (1) *mā-* and (2) *mam-* (accusative). We have also a third plural oblique base in Modern Telugu, i.e., *mana-*.

Examples : nākun (dative), but *nanun* and *nannun*.
mākun (dative), but *mamun* and *mammun*.

We have also *manakun* and *manalan*.

The Verbal Pronominal Suffixes.

The first personal singular suffixes are—
(1) Present progressive, *-ānu*, e.g., *vaṇḍucunnānu*.

(2) Past, *-in*, *-ini*, e.g.—
vaṇḍitin (Old Telugu).
vaṇḍitini (New Telugu).
(3) Future, *-an*, e.g., *vaṇḍaṅgalan*.
(4) Indefinite, *-un*, e.g., *vaṇḍudun*.

The first personal plural suffixes are—
(1) Present progressive *-āmu*, e.g., *vaṇḍucunnāmu*.
(2) Past, *-imi*, e.g., *vaṇḍitimi*.
(3) Future, *-amu*, e.g., *vaṇḍaṅgalamu*.
(4) Indefinite, *-umu*, e.g., *vaṇḍudumu*.

N.B.—Modern Telugu has also *-ānu* and *-āmu*, e.g., *vaṇḍinānu* and *vaṇḍināmu*.

MINOR DIALECTS.

(1) *Korava.*

[*Reference*—Linguistic Survey, Vol. IV, pages 318 to 320.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular is *nā*, *nānu*.
Do. plural is *nāga*.
(*b*) Oblique first person singular is *nan-*.
Do. plural is *naṅgaḷa-*.
(*c*) First person singular verbal termination is *-ē* (*-i*).
First person singular verbal termination is *-ō*.

(2) *Kaikāḍi*.

[*Reference*—Linguistic Survey, Vol. IV, pages 333 to 335.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular is *nā*, *nān*.
Do. plural is *nāṅg*.
(*b*) Oblique first person singular is *nān-*.
Do. plural is *nāṅgaḷa-*.
(*c*) Verbal suffix first person singular is *-ē* (*-ī*, *-i*).
Do. plural is *-ō* (*-ū*).

(3) *Toḍa.*

[*Reference*—Caldwell's Comparative Grammar, page 364.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular : *ān* [ɑ:n].
Do. plural : *ām*, *ōm*, *ēm*.
(*b*) Oblique first person singular : *en-*.
Do. plural : *em-*, *am-*, *nam-*.
(*c*) Verbal suffix first person singular : *-e*.
Do. plural : *-ēme*, *-eme-*.

(4) *Kurukh.*

[*Reference*—Linguistic Survey, Vol. IV, pages 413 to 417.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular : *ēn*.
Do. plural : *ēm* and *nām*.

(*b*) Oblique first person singular : *eṅg-*.
Do. plural : *em-* and *nam-*.

(*c*) Verbal suffix first person singular :
- *-an* (mas.).
- *-ēn* (fem.)
- *-on* (future).

Do. plural :
- *-ām* (mas.).
- *-ēm* (fem.).
- *-om* (future).

(5) *Malto.*

[*Reference*—Linguistic Survey, Vol. IV, pages 452 and 453.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular : *ēn*.
Do. plural : *ēm*.

(*b*) Oblique first person singular : *eṅg-*.
Do. plural : *em-* and *nam-*.

(*c*) Verbal suffix first person singular : *-in* or *-en*.
Do. plural : *-em* or *-im*.

(6) *Kui.*

[*Reference*—Linguistic Survey, Vol. IV, pages 462 and 463.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular : *ānu*.
Do. plural : *āmu* and *āju*.

(*b*) Oblique first person singular : *nan-*, *nā-* (gen.).
Do. plural : *man-* (acc.), *mā-* (gen.).

(*c*) Verbal suffix first person singular : *-ē*, *-ēnu*.
Do. plural : *-āmu*.

(7) *Gōṇḍi.*

[*Reference*—Linguistic Survey, Vol. IV, pages 472 to 488.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular : *nànnā*, *annā*.
Do. plural : *mammaṭ*.

(*b*) Oblique first person singular : *nā-*.
Do. plural : *mā-*.

(*c*) Verbal suffix first person singular : *-an*, *-a*.
Do. plural : *-om*, *-o*.

(8) *Brāhūi.*

[*Reference*—Linguistic Survey, Vol. IV, pages 619 to 630.]

(*a*) Nominative first person singular : *ī*.
Do. plural : *nan*.

(*b*) Oblique first person singular : *kan-*.
Do. plural : *nan-*.

(*c*) Verbal suffix first person singular : *-v*, *-t*.
Do. plural : *-n*.

TABLE I.

A. The First Personal Pronouns.

—	Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Tuḷu.	Kanarese.	Kui (Orissa).	Kōlāmī.	Gōṇḍī.	Kuru<u>kh</u> (Bengal).	Malto (Bengal).	Telugu.	Brāhūī.
Nominative: Singular.	O.T. *yāṉ* N.T. *yāṉ* (literary) *nāṉ*	*ñāṉ*	*yānu*	O.K. *ān* Mid. K. *ānu nānu* N.K. *nānu*	*ānu*	*ān*	*nannā*	*ēn*	*ēn*	O. Te. *ēnu nēnu* N. Te. *nēnu*	*i*
Plural.	O.T. *yām nām* N.T. *yām* (literary) *nām*	*ñāṅṅaḷ ñaṅṅaḷ eṅṅaḷ* *nammaḷ namma nām nōm*	*yeṅkuḷu* *nama*	O.K. *ām* (*nāvu* A.D.) 1181 Mid. K. *āvu nāvu* N.K. *nāvu*	*āmu*	*ām*	*mammāt*	*ēm nām* (inclusive)	*ēm nām* (inclusive)	O. Te. *ēmu nēmu mēmu* N. Te. *mēmu*	*nan*
Oblique: Singular.	*eṉ-*	*eṉ-*	*en-*	O.K. *en-* Mid. K. N.K. *nan-*	*nā-*	*an-*	*nā-*	*eṅg-*	*en-*	*nā-*	*kan-*
Plural.	*em- nam-*	*ñaṅṅal- nām-*	*yeṅkuḷ- nam-*	O.K. *em-* Mid. K. *em- (ev-) nam-* N.K. *nam-*	*mā-*	*am-*	*mā-*	*em- nam-*	*em- nam-*	*mā-*	*nan-*

B. Verbal Terminations of the First Person.

—	Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Tuḷu.	Kanarese.	Kui (Orissa).	Kōlāmi.	Gōṇḍī.	Kurukh (Bengal).	Malto (Bengal).	Telugu.	Brāhūī.
Singular.	O.T. *-en̲* *-ēn̲* *-al* Mid. T. *-en̲*, *-ēn̲*, *-an̲-* (future) N.T. *-ēn̲*	O.M. -ēn *-en* (future) *-an* (future) N. Mal. (*nil*)	*-e* (*-i*)	O.K. *-en* Mid K. *-enu*, *-e* N.K. *-enu*, *-e*, *-ēnu*	*-ēnu* (future negative) *-ē* (past) *-i* (future) also. *-ānu* (in nouns).	*-en* (negative) *-ān* *-ūn*	*-an* (imperfect and past). *-a*	*-an* *-en* (feminine) *-on* (future)	*-en* *-on* (optative)	M. Te. *-in i* (past) *-an* (future) *-ānu* (present progressive)	*-v*, *-t*
Plural.	O.T. *-em*, *-ēm*, *-am*, *-ām* Mid. T. *-ēm* and *-ōm* N.T. *-ōm*	O. Mal. *-ōm* N. Mal. (*nil*)	*-a*	O.K. *-em* Mid. K. *-evu* N.K. *-evu* (*-ivi*) *-ēvi*	*-āmu*	*-ām*	*-om* *-am*	*-am* *-ēm* (feminine). *-om* (future).	*-em* *-om* (optative)	*-imi* *-amu* *-āmu*	*-n*

References—

(1) Gōṇḍī Grammar, by H. D. Williamson.
(2) Kui Grammar, by Lingam Latchmaji.
(3) Kōlāmi, Linguistic Survey.
(4) Kurukh, by Ford Hahn.
(5) Malto, Linguistic Survey.
(6) Brāhūī, by Denys De Bray.

SECTION II.

THE QUALITY OF THE VOWEL OF THE BASE OF THE FIRST PERSONAL PRONOUN IN PRIMITIVE DRAVIDIAN.

THE PRONOUN OF THE FIRST PERSON SINGULAR.

I. *Its form in the various Dravidian dialects—*

(*a*) In Old Tamil and Malayāḷam it is *yāṉ*.
In Tuḷu it is *yānu*.
In Old Kanarese and Kōlāmī it is *ān*.
In Mid. Kanarese and Kui it is *ānu*.
In Old Telugu it is *ēnu*.
In Kuruk͟h and Malto it is *ēn*.

(*b*) New Tamil has, beside *yāṉ*, *nāṉ*.
Malayāḷam has *ñān* [ɲæ̃:n].
New Kanarese and Korava, a dialect of Tamil, have *nānu*.
New Telugu has *nēnu*.

(*c*) Gōṇḍī has *nannā* and *annā*.
Korava has, beside *nānu*, *nā*.
Kaikāḍi has, beside *nān*, *nā*.
Baḍaga has the plural *nām* for the singular.

From a careful study of the above the following inferences may be drawn :—

(1) The vowel of the base of the first person singular is *ā* in all the languages except Telugu, Kuruk͟h and Malto where we have *ē*.

(2) The initial nasal as in *nāṉ*, *nēnu*, etc., is characteristic of the modern dialect of Tamil, Kanarese and Telugu.

Malayāḷam which is itself a dialect of Tamil has *ñ*.
Korava and Kaikāḍi, the uncultivated dialects of Tamil, and Baḍaga, the uncultivated hill dialect of Kanarese, have also the initial *n*.

(3) All the dialects have the pronominal singular suffix *n*.

In Korava and Kaikāḍi it is occasionally lost.

THE PRONOUN OF THE FIRST PERSON PLURAL.

II. The followingare the forms of this pronoun in the various Dravidian dialects :—

ā-types.
(*a*) Old Tamil *yām*.
Old Kanarese and Kōlāmī *ām*.
Mid. Kanarese *āvu* (< *āmu*).
Kui *āmu*.

ā-types —*cont.*
(*b*) New Tamil *nām.*
Malayāḷam *nām.*
Kurukh and Malto *nām.*
Tuḷu *nama.*

ē-types.
(*c*) Old Telugu *ēmu.*
Kurukh and Malto *ēmu.*
(*d*) Old Telugu *nēmu.*
New Telugu *mēmu.*

(*e*) In Tamil and Malayāḷam we have double plurals: e.g., Tamil has *nāṅkaḷ* which is *nām* + *kaḷ*, *m* > *ṅ* before *k*. Malayāḷam has *ñāṅṅaḷ* [ɲæ:ŋŋəḷ], *ñaṅṅaḷ*, *eṅṅaḷ* and *nammaḷ*. The last three have short *a* through the influence of the oblique forms. In Tuḷu we have *yeṅkuḷu.*

From an examination of what is given above we are able to draw the same inferences as in the case of the first person singular—

(1) The vowel of the pronominal base is *ā* except in Telugu, Kurukh and Malto in which languages it is *ē*.

In Tuḷu we have *e* in *yeṅkuḷu* and *a* in *nama.*

In Kurukh and Malto we have also *ā* in *nām* (the inclusive pronoun).

Gōṇḍī has *mammaṭ* (we), thus showing *a* as the vowel of the base.

(2) The initial nasal in *nām*, *mēmu*, etc., is characteristic of modern dialects.

(3) *m* is the pronominal plural suffix in all languages.

III A study of the results of the examination of the various forms of the first person singular and plural in the different Dravidian dialects shows us clearly that—

(1) the vowel of the pronominal base oscillates between *ā* and *ē*,

(2) the forms with initial nasal are new and hence derived from old forms,

(3) hence the primitive base of the first personal pronoun is either *ā* or *ē* or some sound between the two.

IV. We have now to inquire as to which is the probable primitive Dravidian form of the vowel of the first personal pronoun.

(*a*) Can it be *ē*?

This seems to be improbable for two reasons—

(1) *Firstly*, the majority of the Dravidian languages have *ā* and not *ē* as the vowel of the pronominal base. Telugu, Kurukh and Malto are the only languages that have *ē*. Even these show forms with *ā*. Kurukh and Malto have *nām* beside *ēm*. Telugu, in the dialect of the common low-class people, has *nānu* for *nēnu*. This form *nānu* is found so far north as Vizagapatam and Gōdāvari.

(2) *Secondly*, Primitive Dravidian *ē*, in root accented syllables, is preserved in all the languages, whether it be initial or medial as is shown in the following tables I and II. In no case does it become *ā*.

TABLE I.

Primitive Dravidian ē *(initial).*

Telugu.		Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.
1. ēgu	= to go ...	ēku ...	ēkuka ...	...	...
2. ēru	= to attain age	ēṟu to rise	ēruka ...	ēṟu ...	ēru (to ascend)
3. ēḍu	= seven ...	ēḻu ...	ēḻu ...	ēḻu, ēḷu ...	ēḷu
4. ēṇamu	= an antelope.	ēṇam ...	...	ēṇa ...	...
5. ētamu	= a water lift...	ēṟṟam ...	ēṟṟam (rise)	ēta ...	ēru (to ascend)
6. ēdu	= a porcupine	ēṉam ...	..	ēdu ...	...
7. ēmaru	= to be off one's guard	ēmaru ...	ēmāḷi (silly man)	...	...
8. ēru	= a plough of two oxen	ēr ...	ēru ...	ēru kandāya (plough-tax)	...
9. ērpaḍu	= to happen ...	ēṟpaḍu ...	...	ēṟpaḍisu (to arrange)	...
10. ēlaki	= the Cardamom tree	ēlam ...	ēlam ..	ēlakki ...	ēlakki
11. ēlamu	= auction ...	ēlam ...	...	ēlam ...	ēlamu
12. ēvamu	= disgust	ēvam (fault)	...	ēva ...	...

TABLE II.

Primitive Dravidian ē *(medial).*

Tamil.		Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.
1. kēṭu	= evil ...	kēṭu ...	kēḍu ...	kēḍu ...	kīḍu, cēṭu
2. tēkku	= the teak ...	tēkku ..	tēgu ...	...	tēku, ṭēku
3. tēṭṭai	= clearness ...	..	tēṭe ...	tēṭu ...	tēṭa.
4. tēṉ	= honey ...	tēṉ ...	jēnu ...	..	tēne, tēniya
5. tēr	= a car ..	tēr ...	tēr ...	tēru ...	tēr
6. tēḷ	= a scorpion ...	tēl ...	cēḷu ...	tēḷu ...	tēḷ
nēṟṟu	= yesterday ...	...	...	...	nēḍu (to-day)
8. pētai	= a poor man.	...	...	pēde (a peon ?)	pēda
9. pēṉ	= a louse ...	pēṉ ...	pēn ..	pēnu ...	pēnu
10. pēr	= a name ...	pēr ...	...	...	pēru
11. mēl	= superiority...	mēl ...	...	mēlu ...	mēlu
12. vēṭṭai	= hunting ...	vēṭṭa ...	...	...	vēṭa
13. vēmpu	= the margosa tree	vēmpu ...	bēvu ...	bēvu ...	vēmu
14. vēr	= a root ...	vēr ...	...	bēru ..	vēru
15. cēri	= a street ...	cēri ...	kēri ..	kēṛi ...	gēṛi

(*b*) Can the vowel of the Primitive Dravidian first person be *ā*?

This too is not at all probable; for Primitive Dravidian *ā* whether medial or initial in accented root syllables is regularly preserved in all the Dravidian languages as will be seen from the following table:—

TABLE III.

Primitive Dravidian ā *(initial).*

Tamil.		Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.
1. ā	= a cow ...	ā ...	āvu ..	...	āvu
2. āku	= to become ...	ākuka ...	...	ā pini ...	agu
3. āṭu	= to play ...	āṭu ...	āḍu ...	āḍu ...	āḍu
4. āṇi	= a nail ...	āṇi ...	āṇi	āṇi ...	āṇi
5. ār	= to be full ...	āru ...	āṟu (fullness)	āru ..	āru (to be full of)
6. āṟu	= to be quenched	āṟuka ..	āṟu ..	āṟuni ..	āṟu
	= six ...	āṟu ..	āṟu ...	āji ...	āṟu
7. āvi	= breath ...	āvi ...	āvi ...	āli ...	āvi

Primitive Dravidian ā *(medial).*

Tamil.		Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.
1. kāṭu	= a forest ...	kāṭu ...	kāḍu ...	kāḍu ...	kāḍu
2. kāṇ	= to see ...	kāṇukā ...	kāṇ(u) ..	kāṇisāvuni (to show)	kāṇu
3. kāṇi	= 1/64 ...	kāṇi ...	kāṇi ...	...	kāṇi
4. kāppu	= protection ..	kāppu ..	kāpu ...	kāpu ...	kāpu
5. kāy	= an unripe fruit	kāy ...	kāy ...	kāyi ...	kāya
	= to grow hot.	kāyuka ...	kāy ..	kāyuni ...	kāyu
6. kār	= a season ...	kār	kāru (a crop grown in the rainy season)	kāru .	kāru
7. kāram	= pungency ...	kāra ...	gāra ..	kāra ..	gāra

CONCLUSION.

Thus it is clear from what has been shown above that the root-vowel of the Primitive Dravidian first personal pronoun seems to have been neither *ā* nor *ē*, as both these sounds are preserved without change in all the Dravidian languages. Hence it must be a vowel between *ā* and *ē*. This vowel may be conveniently represented by *ǣ*.

A sound of this quality changes naturally into *ē* or *ā*. [Cf. Primitive Germanic *ǣ* > *ā* in W. Germanic and *ē* in E. Germanic.] Thus—

Pr. Drav. *ǣ* → *ǣ* > *ʸǣ* (written *yā*). Old Tamil and Tuḷu.
→ *ē* Telugu, Kui and Malto.
→ *ā* Kanarese, Kui and Kōlāmī.

N.B.—This sound *ǣ* is heard even to-day in the dialectal pronunciation of *nāṉ*. It is also heard in the Malayāḷam *ñāṅṅaḷ* which is pronounced [ɲǣːŋŋəḷ]

NOTE I.—Old Tamil yā (= jæ:).

From a careful phonetic examination of the speech of the Tamil people, it is clear that whenever they pronounce an initial palatal vowel they regularly start this vowel with an enunciative palatal sound, namely, i̯ —or *y*, according to the system of transliteration adopted in this thesis. This *y* (=[j]) in international phonetic script) may be called a 'Vorschlag', to use a German expression. It is heard by European scholars in the Tamil pronunciation of *e*, *ē*, *i* or *ī*. The word 'Emden', for instance, is pronounced by the Tamils as '*yemden*'; the pronoun 'it' is '*yit*,' and so on. Hence in the system of transliteration adopted by European scholars to represent Dravidian sounds, we find *yĕ* for *ĕ* and *yĭ* for *ĭ* (vide Kittel's Kanarese Dictionary, Gundert's Malayāḷam Dictionary, Manner's Tuḷu Dictionary, Brown's Telugu Dictionary (old edition), etc.).

This enunciative 'Vorschlag' heard before *ĕ* or *ĭ* is inherent in the Tamil pronunciation of those vowels: and thus the Tamils know only one kind of initial *e*, *ē*, *i* or *ī*, namely, *ye*, *yē*, *yi* or *yī*. Hence they represent each of these sounds only by one symbol, e.g., எ, ஏ, இ, ஈ. We have therefore no symbol in Tamil or in any of the other Dravidian languages to represent the pure *e*, *ē*, *i* or *ī*. The Tamil-speakers themselves are not conscious, as both Doctor Collins and Professor Hunter point out, of the existence of this 'Vorschlag' in their speech, though it is heard by European scholars with a greater or less degree of clearness.

This phonetic peculiarity being found in all the Dravidian languages, must have been surely the characteristic feature of Old Tamil also. Now, if the base vowel of the Primitive Dravidian first personal pronoun was *ǣ* (i.e., an open *ē*-sound) as was proved above, then this sound was really *yǣ* [jæ:] in Old Primitive Tamil. And when *yǣ* had to be represented in writing a need must have been felt by the old Tamils to represent the Vorschlag *y*, in order that the vowel sound in *yǣ* might be distinguished from the ordinary back *ā*, for both of which they had only one symbol. Thus the Primitive Dravidian *ǣ* was pronounced *yǣ* by the old Tamils, but was represented by *yā*.

That the Primitive Tamil people did not invent a separate symbol for *æ* is not surprising at all. For in their phonetic consciousness *æ* was very near *ā* and could therefore be conveniently represented by the symbol for *ā*. Further the words with initial *ǣ*-sound in Primitive Dravidian were so few that the Tamil people thought it was not necessary to have a separate symbol for it; and the distinction in pronunciation between *yǣ* and *ā* was preserved, as they thought, by the

Vorschlag' *y* being represented in writing. Thus *yā* always stood in Old Tamil for *ʸǣ* and the 'Vorschlag' *y* clearly showed the difference between the pronunciation of *ā* (in *yā*) and the simple *ā* in the other words beginning with back *ā*.

To sum up—

The Old Tamil *yā* stands for *ʸǣ* which is but Primitive Dravidian *ǣ*. The *y* in *yā* represents the 'Vorschlag' heard in pronouncing the *ǣ* in *ʸǣ* (written *yā*). And this *yā*, representing Primitive Dravidian *ǣ*, is answered in Kanarese by *ā* and in Telugu by *ē* as will be evident from the following table :—

TABLE IV.

Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.
1. āṭu (Old Tamil yāṭu) = a goat	āṭu ...	āḍu ...	ēḍu ...	ēḍaka, ēṭa
2. āṇṭu (Old Tamil yāṇṭu) = a year	āṇṭu ...	...	oḍu, as in iyyoḍu and mūvoḍu	ē(ṃ)ḍu
3. āṟu (Old Tamil yāṟu) = a river	āṟu ...	...	...	ēṟu
4. āṉai (Old Tamil yāṉai) = an elephant	āna ...	āne ...	āne ...	ēniga, ēnuga
5. āḷu = to rule	āḷu ...	āḷu ..	āḷu	ēlu
6. yāṉ = I	(ñān) (Primitive yān).	ān ...	yānu ...	ēnu

NOTE II.—Old Tamil ʸǣ > ā in Mid. Tamil.

Old Tamil *ʸǣ* > *ā* in Mid. Tamil; and in the transition of *ʸǣ* to *ā*, there would naturally be many grades of distinction. As in each grade the *ǣ* of *ʸǣ* approaches more and more *ā*, the Vorschlag *y* would be less and less heard; and in the final stage when *ʸǣ* > *ā*, the *y* would be completely dropped. Thus the *yā* words would be written clearly with *ā*.

But in all periods of Tamil literature, poets had the licence of using even obsolete forms of words. Hence even in Mid. Tamil literature we find *yā-* and *ā*-forms are indifferently used. In New Tamil, more especially in the living dialect of it, the *ā*-forms alone are current. The following list illustrates the promiscuous use of *yā-* and *ā*-forms in Mid. Tamil literature.

The following list illustrates clearly the mixture of forms with *yā* and *ā*.

In the Aiṉkuṟunūṟu we have *yā*-forms, as—

yāmai (43, 44, 81), *yāṉai* (356).

In the Puṟanāṉūṟu we have—

āmai (42, 70, etc.), *āṭu* (54, 197, etc.), beside *yāṉai* (3, 4, etc.), *yāḷi* (207).

In the Cīvakacīṅtāmaṇī we have—

āmai (pages 552 and 835), *āḷi* (736, 866), beside *yāṉai* (176, 624, etc.), *yāḷi* (554).

In the Kuṟaḷ we have—

āmai (126), besid *yāl* (66) and *yāṉai* (599).

In the Tiruvācakam—

yāṉai, *4*, 11 ; *5*, 101, beside *āṉāi*, *6*, 81 ; *8*, 79.

yāṟu, *2*, 106 ; *5*, 288, beside *āṟu* *4*, 81 ; *19*, 4 and 16.

SECTION III.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS WITH INITIAL NASAL.

It has been pointed out in the foregoing sections that—

(1) the root-vowel of the first personal pronoun was very likely *æ* in Primitive Dravidian.

(2) the pronominal forms of the first person with initial nasal are later than the forms without it.

It is the purpose of this section to explain the development of the forms with initial nasal. This subject is an extremely difficult one, and must be considered still—a problem that has not been satisfactorily explained by any philologist. I have, however, made an humble attempt in this section to give a possible explanation of this difficult subject.

A careful comparative study of the first personal pronominal forms with initial nasal in the various important Dravidian languages shows that—

(1) In Kanarese the first personal pronominal forms with initial nasal were not developed till the eleventh century A.D. We do not find them mentioned either in Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa or in the Śabdānuśāsana. In the commentary of the Śabdānuśāsana, written evidently some time after the text, we find mention is made of *nānu* and *nāvu* as forms also used in literature. According to Kittel *nāvu* (< *nāmu*, 'we') is the first to appear and is found in a Śāsana of A.D. 1181. Subsequent to this period *nānu* also makes its appearance.

(2) In Tamil, however, we find *nām* beside *yām* in the oldest literature. It is mentioned, in the Tolkāppiyam, as one of the two forms of the first person plural. But *nāṉ*, the singular form of *nām*, appears only four or five centuries later. It is mentioned in the Vīracōḻiyam as one of the forms of the first person singular.

N.B.—(1) In the Kuṟaḷ, the oldest of Tamil literary works, we find that *yām* is used fifteen times, and *nām* only once.

(2) The oblique *em-* occurs fifteen times and *nam-* only five times.

From these facts only one of two inferences is possible.

(1) Even in Primitive Dravidian there was a double form in the plural, one without the nasal and the other with it. This double form produced subsequently a corresponding double form in the singular, or

(2) Primitive Dravidian had no form with an initial nasal. This must then have developed later out of a phonetic tendency inherent already in the parent language but becoming operative gradually and asserting itself at a later period.

The first of these two inferences has, however, the following arguments against it:—

(1) Though *nām* is found in the oldest period of Tamil literature, Old Kanarese literature has no *nām*, or *nān*. *Nām (nāvu)* appears in Kanarese eleven centuries after its appearance in Tamil literature. Further the oldest Telugu literature makes a predominant use of *ēn*. If the parent language had also the form with the initial nasal, there is no reason why it should appear so very late in Kanarese. In that case Old Kanarese would have inherited from the parent language the form with the initial nasal which, historically, is not the case. (2) Again the oblique cases and the verbal terminations too should possess double forms, one with the initial nasal and the other without it. But we find that amongst the verbal terminations in any of the Dravidian languages there is no form with the initial nasal in any period of the development of these languages.† (3) Further the oblique case forms with the initial nasal are very late in their appearance, and these are synchronous in their appearance with the nominative forms possessing an initial nasal. These facts drive us naturally to the conclusion that the second of the above two inferences alone must be accepted, namely:— *the forms with the initial nasal must have developed later in each individual language out of a phonetic tendency already inherent in the parent language but becoming operative gradually and asserting itself later in each individual language.*

This phonetic tendency is the simple phenomenon that a nasal following a vowel nasalizes it, and if in the language in which the nasalized vowel is developed, there be no symbol to represent it in writing, it may be expressed in writing by a nasal and the vowel. This conjunct symbol (i.e., nasal plus vowel) may first have the original pronunciation of a nasalized vowel, but later, by the influence of the spelling, pronunciation may assume actually the value of a nasal and a vowel in the later pronunciation of the word. As, before the attempt to represent the nasalized vowel by a conjunct symbol, the nasalization may drop off through the influence of the more primitive written symbol—which is merely the vowel—the forms with the conjunct symbol may be only few and thus make this principle of vowel nasalization appear, as it were, not originally of universal application.

---

† Kuraḷ 1193 has *vālunam*; but the *n* of *-nam* is an excrescent letter. Compare *vīlunar* (third person plural) in the same stanza.

The nasalization of a vowel through the influence of a following nasal seems to be a common phenomenon in all the languages. In the spoken dialects of all the Dravidian languages we find nasal and non-nasal forms of vowels, e.g., in Tamil *tām*, 'themselves', is pronounced as [tã:m] or as [tɔ̃:m]. Though there may be a difference in the quality of the vowel *ā* as pronounced in the various dialects of spoken Tamil, there is no doubt that the vowel is distinctly nasalized. It is heard even in the carefully delivered speech of Tamil paṇḍits. The word *nān* itself is more commonly pronounced as [næ̃:]. In the Korava dialect of Tamil we have *nā* (probably [næ̃:]) as the actual first person singular form, and *nāga* (probably [nã:gaḷ]) as the plural. In Kanarese we have *nā* dialectically standing for *nānu* in '*nā ballida, tā ballida nendu*' (Cp. Dr. Kittel's Dictionary, page 850). Here *nā* is equivalent to *nānu* and *tā* to *tānu*. These seem, therefore, to represent the forms [nã:] and [tã:]. In Telugu *pāmu*, 'a snake', is pronounced [pã:mu] or [pɔ̃:mu]. The third person singular in Telugu is *vāḍu* or *vā(ṃ)ḍu*. These forms are pronounced more commonly as [vã:ḍu]. Almost all the words in Telugu which have an ardhānusvāra indicate a vowel with nasalization (see my thesis on Nasal and Consonant).

The same principle of nasalization must have been at work even in Primitive Dravidian. Vowels followed by a nasal would first become nasalized and the nasal element would be found only in pronunciation, as there is no symbol in any of the Dravidian languages by which a nasalized vowel can be indicated. After some time the nasalization would likely drop off even from the spoken dialect through the influence of the written forms of the word.

A few words might, however, preserve the nasalization and the nasal element of the vowel would naturally be indicated by a nasal being prefixed to the vowel in writing, e.g., *ǣ* (written *ā*) when nasalized would be written *nā* or *ñā*, *ñ* indicating the palatal character of the vowel.

The following is a list of words which show an initial nasal in one or other of the Dravidian languages :—

(1) Tamil *imai* or *nimai*, an 'eyelid', is in Malayāḷam *ima* in Kanarese *eme* or *eve*.

Tamil *nimai* seems to have developed from [ĩmæi] < [imæi].

(2) Kanarese *īju* or *isu*, 'to swim', is *icu* or *īju* in Tuḷu, *ī(ṃ)du* [ĩ:dŭ] in Telugu and *nīntu* in Tamil and Malayāḷam.

Telugu clearly establishes the developmentof [ĩ:dŭ] from [indŭ], and thus shows an intermediate stage. Evidently therefore, *nīntu* [nĩ:ndŭ] is developed from [ĩ:ndŭ].

(3) Kanarese and Telugu have *eṇḍri*, 'a crab.' Kanarese has also *ēḍi*, but in Tamil and Malayāḷam we have *ñaṇṭu*. In Modern Tamil we have *naṇṭu*.

(4) Old Telugu *i(m)gu*, 'to depart', New Telugu *īgu* is in Kanarese also *īgu*. But in Tamil it is represented by *niṅku*, and in Malayāḷam it is *niṅṅu*.

(5) † The Sanskrit word *yama-*, 'death,' is *ñamaṉ* in Old Tamil, and *namaṉ* in New Tamil and Malayāḷam.

Similarly *ǣ* when followed by a nasal as in *ǣn*, 'I,' or *ǣm*, 'we,' would develop into nasalized [æ̃:] and would be written as *nā* or *ñā*, there being no single symbol for nasalized *ǣ*. Thus we have—

[æ:] > [æ̃:] > [ɲæ:] becomes—

[ɲæ:] (written *ñā*) in Malayāḷam and Old Tamil.

[næ:] (written *nā*) in Tamil, Malayālam, Kanarese and Tuḷu.

[ne:] in Telugu.

In attempting to represent in writing the two first personal forms [æ̃:n] and [æ̃:m], a difference would naturally be observed as there develops a difference in the quality of the vowels.

[æ̃:n] remains as such in the first stages, but [æ̃:m] > [ɔ̃:m] through the influence of the labial nasal *m* (see a complete treatment of this principle in the next section under *-ōm*). Thus the Primitive Dravidian forms [æ̃:n] and [æ̃:m] become in pronunciation [æ̃:n] and [ɔ̃:m].

[æ̃:n] has three elements in the pronunciation of its initial vowel: it is (1) a palatal vowel, (2) a nasalized vowel and (3) a long vowel. These three elements are adequately represented only in the conjunct symbol *ñā*. *ñ* is a palatal and a nasal and *ā* is a long vowel. Thus *ñā* has all the elements found in [æ̃:]. The first stage in the representation of [æ̃:] would therefore be *ñā* which would first have the pronunciation of [æ̃:] and then be pronounced as it is spelt. Malayāḷam which ordinarily preserves the original *ñ* has *ñān* for the first person singular. But by the time that *ñāṉ* came to be accepted in the literary dialect of Tamil, the Primitive Dravidian *ñ* had regularly changed to *n* (vide infra for an illustration of this law). Hence we have *nāṉ* in Mid. and New Tamil. Compare here the change of Sanskrit *yama* into *ñamaṉ* in Old Tamil and *namaṉ* in New Tamil. Thus the Malayāḷam form *ñān* marks the intermediate stage in Tamil between *yāṉ* and *nāṉ*. In Rāmacaritam we have *yān*. Thus

---

† This example clearly shows that between *ya* and *na* the intermediate stage is *ña*.

the development of *ñān* from *yān* in Malayāḷam seems to be very clear.

Now the plural of [ǣ:n], namely [ǣ:m] becomes first [ɔ̃:m]. This [ɔ̃: m] has no palatal element in it. Hence it is represented merely as *nām* in writing.† It would not therefore be possible to have the form *ñām* in any of the languages, which is actually the case. Even in Old Tamil we have the form *nām*. Malayāḷam has *nām* beside the singulars *ñān* and *yān*. Further the form *nōm* in Malayāḷam clearly establishes the value of *ā* in *nām* and also illustrates the phonetic principle that the labial nasal *m* nasalizes and rounds the vowel preceding it and also changes its quality.‡ But when the nasal following the base-vowel of the first personal pronominal word is not *m*, the initial nasal preceding the base-vowel may be *ñ*, for example *ñāṅṅaḷ*, an old honorific first person plural in Malayāḷam.

Thus the difference between the initial nasal of the singular *ñān* and that of the plural *nām* in Malayāḷam, clearly illustrates and confirms the principle assumed and worked out in this section. Malayāḷam preserving the original *ñ*, helps us in tracing the several stages in the development of Primitive Dravidian [ǣ:n] and [ǣ:m] in the various individual languages.§

The change of *ñ* into *n* is illustrated by the following words :—

(*a*) Old Tamil and Malayāḷam *ñaṇṭu*, 'a crab', is new Tamil *naṇṭu*.

(*b*) Old Tamil and Malayāḷam *ñāṉ*, 'a bow-string', is in New Tamil *nāṉ*.

(*c*) Old Tamil and Malayāḷam *ñāyiṟu*, 'the sun', is in New Tamil *nāyiṟu*.

(*d*) Old Malayāḷam *ñarampu*, 'a sinew', is in Tamil *narampu*.

(*e*) Old Malayāḷam *ñāṟu*, 'a string', is in Tamil *nāṟu*.

(*f*) Malayāḷam *ñeṟi*, 'a way', is in Tamil *neṟi*.

(*g*) Old Tamil and Malayāḷam *ñālu*, Malayāḷam *ñēlu*, 'to hang,' is in New Tamil *nālu*.

---

† *nām* has sometimes the spelling pronunciation, namely [na:m]; but it never has the pronunciation [næ:m]. The pronunciation of *nāṉ* (sg.), however, is more often [næ:n] than [na:n].

‡ Professor Mark Hunter writes in his remarks on this thesis : "So far as my small observation goes, Modern Dravidian has no pure [ɔ:] sound ; but nasalized [ɔ̃:] is very common. The change of [a:m] to [ɔ̃:m] would be a very natural phonetic change."

§ Doctor Caldwell says : "The change of *yān* into *nān* would be facilitated if we should take the Malayāḷam *ñān*, as I think we fairly may, as the middle point." Probably Doctor Caldwell did not know that in Malayāḷam itself we have *yān* in Rāmacaritam.

SECTION IV.

THE OBLIQUE BASES.

In all the Dravidian languages the quantity of the pronominal base-vowel in the oblique cases differs from the quantity of the same vowel in the nominative. In the nominative it is long; in the oblique cases, short.

This difference is due to the position of the accent or stress. In the nominative the stress is on the base-vowel, viz., on *ā* in *yān*, *ān* and *ñān*; and on *ē* in *ēnu* and *nēnu*. But when these words are declined and inflexional suffixes are added to them the stress moves on to the next syllable as if to take a more central position that would enable the original root to bear the weight of additional syllables. The result of this accent-change is that the vowel of the nominative becomes unstressed and hence short in the oblique cases.

The vowel of the nominative is *ǣ* in Primitive Dravidian (vide supra) in the case of the first personal pronoun, and its unstressed form is *æ*.

This *æ* later becomes *a* in Kōlāmī and *e* in Tamil, Malayāḷam, Kanarese and Tuḷu, Kurukh and Malto.

Thus—

æ —
- *a* in Kōlāmī;
- *e* Tamil, Malayāḷam, Kanarese, Tuḷu, Kurukh and Malto;
- *æ* in Telugu, Kui and Gōṇḍī.

(1) In Kōlāmī the oblique base for the singular is *an* and for the plural *am*.

(2) In Telugu, Kui and Gōṇḍī, the *æ* of *æn* or *æm* drops owing to the accent resting on the next syllable and the vowel of the next accented syllable, which is *a*, is lengthened. Thus we have *nā* for the singular and *mā* for the plural. This dropping of *æ* and the lengthening of the accented vowel of the second syllable is prehistoric (vide Appendix on Vowel-lengthening in Telugu).

(3) In Tamil, Malayāḷam, Kanarese, Tuḷu, Kurukh and Malto, the oblique singular base is *en-* and the plural oblique base is *em-*. In Tuḷu and Malayāḷam *em-* is found as the first element of the double plural oblique base *eṅṅaḷ* (Malayāḷam) and *yeṅkuḷu* (Tuḷu).

Similarly the oblique forms derived from the first personal substantive pronouns with initial nasal such as *ñān*, *nān*, *nānu*, etc., have the base-vowel short.

Thus for the singular oblique base of the first person we may have *ñan-* or *nan-*, for the plural oblique base *ñam-* or *nam-*,

-n being the singular pronominal termination and *-m* the plural pronominal termination.

Of these *nan-* is found only in Kanarese: *ñan-* is probably to be seen in the Malayāḷam plural form *ñaṅṅaḷ*, though here it is not impossible that the base is *ñam-*. The form *nam-* is found in Tamil, Malayāḷam, Tuḷu and Kanarese, Kurukh and Malto, or in other words in all the languages except Kōlāmī and the Telugu group (i.e., Telugu, Kui and Gōṇḍī). *nam-* is sometimes pronounced [næm], but the spelling pronunciation [nam] is the most common. In Telugu and Kui, however, the accusatives alone are formed from a nasal oblique base, i.e., *nan-* and *mam-*. *nan-* is the singular and *mam-* which comes from *nam-* by assimilation (cf. Telugu *mēmu* < *nēmu*), is the plural oblique base of the accusative. For example:—

In Telugu—

First person singular accusative—*nanun*, *nannun* and *nannu*.

First person plural accusative—*mamun*, *mammun* and *mammu*.

In Kui—

First person singular accusative (and dative) is *naṅge*.

First person plural accusative (and dative) *maṅge*.

N.B.—(1) *mamun* is from *namun*; *n* > *m* by assimilation (cf. Telugu *mēmu* beside *nēmu* and Kurukh *maṅge*).

(2) In Kui, the accusative and dative fall together—

naṅge = *nan* + *ge*:

maṅge = *mam* + *ge*: *mam* < *nam* by assimilation (cf. Telugu).

In Tamil, Malayāḷam and Tuḷu we have also double plural oblique stems: for example, from *yāṅkaḷ* and *nāṅkaḷ* and *nāṅkaḷ*—

eṅkaḷ (Tamil), *eṅṅaḷ* (Malayāḷam), *eṅkul* (Tuḷu) and *ñaṅṅaḷ* (Malayāḷam).

In Tuḷu as well as in very Primitive Tamil all the cases are formed by adding the case terminations directly to the oblique stems, e.g.—

Tuḷu—

First person singular:
- Acc. *yen-anu (yen + anu).*
- Dat. *yeṅku (yen + ku).*
- Gen. *yena (yen + a).*

First person plural:
- Acc. *namanu (nam + anu).*
- Dat. *naṅku (nan + ku).*
- Gen. *nama (nam + a).*

Tamil—

First person singular:
- Acc. *eṉṉai (eṉ + ai).*
- Dat. *eṟku (eṉ + ku).*
- Gen. *eṉa (eṉ + a).*

Tamil—

First person plural : Acc. *nammai (nam + ai),*
emmai (em + ai).
Gen. *ema (em + a),*
nama (nam + a).

N.B.—In Old Tamil, however, only the dative singular is thus formed directly from the oblique base by the addition of the case suffix. The genitive is formed, as in New Tamil, by the addition of the adjectival suffix *-a*.

In Old Tamil, Modern Tamil, Old and Modern Malayāḷam and Kanarese, all the cases but the dative are formed as in Tuḷu by directly adding the case suffixes to the oblique stems *en-*, *em-*, *nan-* and *nam-*. In Telugu the only case which is formed by adding the termination directly to the base is the accusative. The oblique stems for the accusative of the first person in Telugu are *nan-* singular and *mam-* (< *nam-*) plural. Kui resembles in this respect Telugu.

On the other hand, the dative in Tamil, Malayāḷam and Kanarese and all the cases but the accusative in Telugu are formed from the oblique base by the addition of a formative : vide tables on pages 29 and 30.

In Telugu, however, the primitive oblique stems **æna* and **æma* underwent changes even in the prehistoric period of the language through the influence of the accent changing from one syllable to another.

The accent or stress in the case of pronominal words formed directly from the base is on the case suffix, while the accent in the case of words formed from the base with the help of the formative is on the formative, e.g.—

Primitive **ǣ́n*	but (1) *eṉṉai*, *eṉṉā́l*	Tamil.
	enné, *emmíl*	Malayāḷam.
	ennánu,	Kanarese.
	yenánu,	Tuḷu.
	(2) *yenkú*,	Tuḷu.
	eṉákku,	Tamil.
	enáge,	Kanarese.
	eníkku,	Malayāḷam.

In Tamil, Malayāḷam, Kanarese and Tuḷu, the result of the accent moving from the first syllable of the nominative to the second syllable in oblique forms is merely the shortening of the initial vowel, e.g.—

**ǣ́na* > *ená* through **æná*, and **æma* > **æmá* > *emá*.

But in Telugu the effects of accent-change are far more reaching. As a result of the accent shifting from the first

syllable to the second in the oblique forms, the accented vowel of the second syllable is lengthened and the unaccented vowel of the first syllable is dropped; and the lengthening of the accented vowel of the second syllable takes place only after this vowel has been assimilated in quality to the vowel of the first syllable. Thus—

*æna > *ænæ > *$_{\text{æ}}$nǽ > nǽ̄ (written *nā*) and *æma > *æmæ > $_{\text{æ}}$mǽ > m^{ǽ} (written *mā*).

For a fuller explanation of this law of vowel-lengthening in Telugu through the influence of accent change vide Appendix I.

The following tables give the oblique cases of the personal pronouns in all the Dravidian languages :—

Singular Oblique Base of Pronouns.

Person.	Oblique cases.	Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Kanarese. O.Ka.	Kanarese. M.Ka.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.	Gōṇḍī.	Kui.	Kurukh.	Kōlāmī (Central Provinces).	Malto.
First ...	2	eṉṉai	enne	ennam	nannamu	yenanu ...	nanun, nannun, nannu	nākun (dat.)	naṅgē (acc.-dat.)	eṅgan ...	anu (ṅg)	eṅgen
	3	eṉṉāl	ennāl	ennim	nanninda	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	4	eṉakku	enikku, inikku ...	enage	nanage	yeṅku ...	nākun, nāku	nākun (acc.)	naṅgē	eṅgā, eṅgāgē.	...	eṅge
	6	eṉ, eṉṉuṭaya ...	en, enṟe ...	ena	nana, nanna	yena ...	nā ..	nāwōr ...	nā, nai	eṅghai ..	anna ...	eṅg(ki)
	7	eṉṉil ...	ennil	ennoḷ	nanalli nannalli	yenaḍa ...	...	nāte ...	nāke ...	eṅgnū	...	eṅgeno
Second ...	2	O.T. niṉṉai, N.T. uṉṉai	ninne	ninnam	ninnanu	ninanu ...	ninun, ninnun, ninnu	nīkun ...	niṅgē (dat.)	ningan ..	...	niṅgen
	3	niṉṉāl uṉṉāl	ninnāl ...	ninnim	nininda		...	...	...	...	...	...
	4	niṉakku uṉakku	ninakku, niṇakku	ninage	...	nikku ..	nīkun, nīku	nīkun	niṅgē (acc.)	niṅgā ...	...	niṅge
	6	niṉ, niṉa uṉṉuṭaya	ninṟe, nin, ninnude	nina	ninna	niṅku, nina	nī ...	nīwōr ...	nī ...	niṅghai ..	inna ...	niṅg(ki)
	7	niṉṉil uṉṉil	ninnil ...	ninnoḷ	ninnalli	ninaḍa ...	...	nīte ...	nīke ...	niṅgnū ...	...	niṅgeno
Reflexive.	2	taṉṉai	tanne	tannam	tannanu	...	tanun, tannun, tannu, tananu	...	...	...	...	taṅgen
	3	taṉṉāl	tannāl	tannim	tanninda	...	...	...	...	...	..	...
	4	taṉakku ...	tanikku ...	tanage	...	...	tanaku ..	...	...	...	...	taṅge
	6	taṉ taṉṉuṭaya	tanṟe, tan ...	tanna	...	...	tana ...	...	...	...	...	taṅg(ke)
	7	taṉṉil	tannil	tannoḷ	tannalli	...	...	...	...	...	.	taṅgeno

Plural Oblique Base of Pronouns.

Person.	Oblique cases.	Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.	Gōṇḍi.	Kui.	Kurukh.	Malto.
First ...	2	emmai, nammai, eṅgaḷai	ñaṅṅaḷe, namme	emmam, nammam, nammanu	namanu, yeṅkuḷenu	mamun, mammun, mammu, manamunu	mākun ...	maṅgē (acc.-dat.)	eman, naman	emen, namen
	3	emmāl, nammāl, eṅgaḷāl	ñaṅṅaḷāl, nammāl	emmim, namminda	...	...	...	...	...	...
	4	emakku, namakku, eṅgaḷukku	ñaṅṅaḷkku, namukku	emage, namage	naṅku, yeṅkuḷegu	mākun, māku, manaku	mākun ...	maṅgē (acc.)	emāgē, naṅgā-gē	eme, name
	6	em-, nam-, eṅgaḷ-	ñaṅṅeḷuḍe, nammuḍe	ema, nama	nama, yeṅkuḷe	mā ...	mā, māwor	mā, mai ...	emhai, namhai	em(ki), nam(ki)
	7	emmil, nammil, eṅgaḷil	ñaṅṅaḷil, nammil (eṅṅaḷil), (emmil)	emmoḷ, nammalli	namaḍu, yeṅkuḷeḍu	...	māte	māke ..	emnū, namnū	emeno, nameno
Second ...	2	nummai, uṅgaḷai, ummai	niṅṅaḷe ...	nimmam, nimmanu	īrenu, nikuḷenu	mimun, mimmun, mimmu, mimmunu	mīkun	miṅgē ...	niman ...	nimen
	3	nummāl, uṅgaḷāl, ummāl	niṅṅaḷāl ...	nimmim, niminda	...	...	...	...	...	...
	4	numakku, uṅgaḷakku, umakku	niṅṅaḷkku ...	nimage ...	nikuḷegu, īregu	mīkun, mīku	mīkun ...	miṅgē ...	nimāgē ...	mīme
	6	num-, um-, uṅgaḷ-	niṅṅaḷuḍe ...	nima ...	nikuḷe, īre	mī ...	mī, mīwor ...	mī ...	nimhai ..	nim(ki)
	7	nummil, uṅgaḷil, ummil	niṅṅaḷil (nimmil)	nimmoḷ, nimmalli	nikuḷeḍu, īreḍu	...	mīte ...	mīke ...	nimnū ...	nimeno

Plural Oblique Base of Pronouns—cont.

Person.	Oblique cases.	Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.	Gōṇḍī.	Kui.	Kuṟukh.	Malto.
Reflexive .	2	taṅgaḷai, tammai	tamme, taṅṅaḷe	tāmmam ...	...	tamun, tammun, tammu, tammunu, tamarini	...	...	...	tamen
	3	taṅgaḷāl, tammāl	tammal, taṅṅaḷāl	tamminu, tammu	...	...	...	...	..	...
	4	taṅgaḷukku, tamakku	tamukku, taṅṅaḷkku	tamage ...	...	tamakun, tamaku, tamariki	...	...	...	tame
	6	tam-, taṅgaḷ, tammuḍaiya	tammuṭe, taṅṅaluṭe	tama ...	...	tama, tamari	...	...	...	tam(-ki)
	7	taṅgaḷil, tammil	tammil, taṅṅaḷil	tammoḷ, tammalli	...	...	...	...	...	tameno

SECTION V.

THE HISTORY OF THE PRONOMINAL TERMINATIONS OF DRAVIDIAN VERBS.

A.—General.

In analysing a fully inflected verb in any Dravidian language, we find that it consists of three distinct parts: (1) the verbal base, (2) the tense-infix, (3) the pronominal termination; e.g., Old Tamil (1) *peyveṉ* (I shall pour) = *pey* + *v* + *eṉ*, (2) *naṭappem* (we shall walk) = *naṭa* + *pp* + *em*. Here, *pey* and *naṭa* are verbal bases; *v* or *pp*, the tense-infix and *eṉ* and *em* the pronominal terminations.

The stress in these fully inflected verbs falls on the central syllable (as in the case of fully declined pronouns, vide section IV), so as to enable the verbal root to bear the weight of added syllables. The central syllable is the syllable denoting the tense-infix. The other parts of the verb are unstressed and hence weak.

The weak form of the termination of the first person was -**æn* or -**æm* [< stressed -**æn* (first person singular) and -**æm* (first person plural)]. The *æ* of -**æn* or -**æm* has, under normal conditions, the same development as in the oblique first person of pronouns, namely—

æ —
- *a* in Gōṇḍī and Kōlāmī.
- *e* in Tamil, Malayāḷam, Kanarese (Tuḷu ?), Kuruk̲h̲ and Malto.
- *æ* in Telugu (?).

Thus normally—

(1) -*an* is the singular and -*am* the plural termination in Gōṇḍī and Kōlāmī;

(2) -*en* (-*eṉ*, Ta.) is the singular and -*em* the plural termination in Tamil, Malayāḷam, Kaṅarese (Tuḷu ?) Kuruk̲h̲ and Malto;

(3) but in Telugu -**æn* and -**æm* undergo many combinative changes under the influence of vowel-harmony (vide Vowel-lengthening in Telugu, infra).

N.B.—(1) In New Kanarese -*em* > -*evu*; *m* > *v* (Sabdamaṇidarpaṇa, 104).
(2) In Tuḷu -**æn* > -**e* through nasalized *e*. Cp. Korava and other rude dialects.

But a study of these terminations is made very complicated especially in Tamil, by the fact that these terminations must have had emphatic and unemphatic forms existing side by side in the parent language itself, one or other of which forms became generalised already in the prehistoric period of the individual branches of the parent language. For example, in Old Tamil beside *-eṉ* we have also *-ēṉ* as the termination of the first person singular; also beside *-em* we have *-ēm* as the termination of the first person plural. Of these *-ēṉ* is the form generalised in Old Malayāḷam.

Again this study is made still more complicated by the development—even in the prehistoric period of individual languages—of new forms through the influence of neighbouring sounds, such as, *m*, *v* [ʋ], etc. Thus in Old Tamil beside *-em*, the first person plural suffix, we have also *-am*, and *-ām*. In Mid. Tamil we have a new form *-ōm*.

I shall now attempt to explain the origin of the various terminations in each of the Dravidian languages.

B.—The Regular Terminations in Tamil, Malayāḷam and Kanarese.

The weak unemphatic form of *-*ǣn* is *-æn*; and of *-*ǣm* is *-*æm*. The *æ* of *-*æn* and *-*æm* changes to *e* in Tamil, Malayāḷam and Kanarese (vide Oblique cases, section IV).

Hence in Tamil, Malayāḷam and Kanarese the regular first person singular verbal termination is *-en* (*-eṉ*, Ta.) and the plural is *-em*.

Kanarese in all the periods of its development has *-en* for the singular and *-em* for the plural. In Mid. Kanarese *-en* > *-enu* and *-em* > *-emu* > *-evu*.

In Old Tamil we have *-eṉ* as one of the singular terminations and *-em* as a plural termination. *-eṉ* and *-em* gradually become obsolete even in Mid. Tamil, i.e., in the Vīracōḻiyam period, and are confined to the future tense. In New Tamil they are completely obsolete.

In Old Malayāḷam we have *-en* as a singular termination restricted to the future tense (vide section 134, Vyākaraṇa-Mitran).

In Malto we have both *-en* and *-em* as regular verbal terminations. In Kōlāmī only *-en* is found.

C.—The Emphatic Forms.

In Old Tamil beside *-eṉ* we have also *-ēṉ* and beside *-em* also *-ēm*. The special form *-am*, the first person plural termination to be explained below, has also an emphatic form *-ām*.

In Mid. Tamil the emphatic forms *-ēṉ* and *-ōm* (a form to be explained infra) are alone common; the other forms are becoming gradually obsolete.

In Modern Tamil *-ēṉ* is the standard singular termination and *-ōm*, the plural; the others are archaic.

In Old Malayāḷam the emphatic forms *-ēn* and *-ōm* were those in use. Though in Old, Mid. and Modern Kanarese the unemphatic forms were those in use, in New Kanarese the emphatic forms *-ēne* (singular) and *-ēve* (plural) are becoming common.

In Old Telugu only the unemphatic forms *-an* (< -**æn*), *-am* (< -**æm*) and *-in*, *-ini* are found. But in New Telugu after the sixteenth century we find the emphatic forms *-ānu* and *-āmu* becoming very common.

In Kurukh we have both emphatic and unemphatic forms. Beside *-an*, *-on*, *-am* and *-om* we have also *-ēn* and *-ēm*.

The only Dravidian languages that seem to have no emphatic forms are Tuḷu, Gōṇḍī and Malto.

D.—The Origin of *-aṉ*, *-ăm*, etc., in Tamil.

In the Tolkāppiyaṁ *-al* is one of the first person singular terminations. This *-al* is considered in the Vīracōḻiyam to be a variant of *-aṉ* which appears in literature a little later than *-al*. Both *-al* and *-aṉ* are considered to be terminations of the first person singular added to verbs in the future tense. The commentaries of the Tolkāppiyam establish the fact that *-al* is a termination added to verbs in the future tense. In the Tirukkuṟaḷ both *-al* and *-aṉ* are used only in the future tense: e.g., *keṭuval*, 'I shall perish' (116); *ceyval*, 'I will make' (1023); and *irappaṉ*, 'I shall beg' (1067).

Further in Old Malayāḷam *-an* which is one of the first person singular terminations is used only in the future tense (article 134, Vyākaraṇa-mitran).

From these facts it seems reasonable to infer that *-aṉ* (or *-al*) being restricted to the future tense, the future infix *v* or *pp* must have something to do in the development of *a*. *v* [ʋ] or *pp* seems to change the original Primitive Dravidian *æ* into *a*; for otherwise it must normally become *e* (vide supra). Thus it would appear the future infix *v* [ʋ] or *pp* converts the Primitive Dravidian *æ* into a spread back vowel *a*.

N.B.—Professor Mark Hunter says: "Neither *p* nor [ʋ] (which is the sound intended by *v*) is pronounced with lip-rounding; they are both spread."

The *-aṉ* thus developed produces a corresponding plural form *-am*. This *-am* again has an emphatic double in *-ām*. Thus *-am* and *-ām* are developments from the singular *-aṉ*.

Like the singular *-aṉ* or *-al*, the plurals *-am* and *-ām* too must have been used only in the future tense in the very early period of Old Tamil. In the Kuṟaḷ, at any rate, we find *-am* and *-ām* used only in the future tense: e.g., *eṇṇuvam*, 'we shall consider' (467); *peṟukuvam*, 'we shall prosper' (1328); *aṟivām*, 'we shall know' (36) and *tīrvām*, 'we shall get rid of' (1063). Subsequently *-am* and *-ām* and even *-aṉ* seem to have had a wider application.

[In Kurukh we find that *æ* is changed into *ō* in the future tense. In Malto, the optative which is a kind of future tense has *-on* and *-om*.]

E.—The Origin of Tamil-Malayāḷam *-ōm*.

In Mid. Tamil, i.e., about the seventh or eighth century A.D., a new form of the first person plural, namely, *-ōm* is developed, and this gradually replaces all the other terminations of the plural in Tamil until it becomes the standard plural suffix in Modern Tamil.

Now the question is: what is the origin of this *-ōm*?

From the oldest period of Tamil we have had *ō*-forms in the other personal pronominal endings. According to the Tolkāppiyam Viṉai, sūtras 14 and 15, *-āṉ*, *-āl* and *-ār*, the third personal pronominal endings, and also *-āy*, the second person singular ending, become respectively in poetry *-ōṉ*, *-ōḷ*, *-ōr* and *-ōy*. This change was no doubt optional. Nevertheless, it is most frequently found in poetry (vide Cilappatikāram which contains examples almost on every page).

Further in Old Malayāḷam we find a similar change. *-āṉ* becomes *-ōṉ*, and *-āḷ* becomes *-ōḷ* though only in the future tense. [Article 136-2, Vyākaraṇa-mitran.]

In Kanarese *avaḷ*, † *avam* and *avar* become *avoḷ*, *avom* and *avor*. [Further *-am* in general may become *-om* (Śabdamaṇi-darpaṇa, sūtra 157), e.g., *nuḍidam* 'he spoke' > *nuḍidom*.]

Thus the analogy of *ō*-forms in all the other personal pronominal words developing out of an *ā*-form seems to have influenced the first person plural and we have thus *-ōm* developed from *-ām*.

Though mere analogy of the other personal pronominal forms may be enough to account for the *-ōm*-form in the first person plural, the fact that *-am* in general changes to *-om*

---

† Doctor Kittel quotes examples from Sāsanas for *am* > *om*, *aḷ* > *oḷ*, *udu* > *odu*, *ar* > *or*, *adu* > *odu*, *āvaḷ* > *āvoḷ*, etc.—Vide Kittel's Kannaḍa Grammar, pages 47, 51, 53, 58, 111 and 112.

in Kanarese, and that in Toḍa *-ām* is pronounced as [ɔ:m] and beside it we have also *-ōm* (vide Doctor Caldwell's Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, page 364), seem to point to the influence of the labial nasal *m* also. Under the influence of *m*, *-ām* first becomes [ɔ:m] then [ɔ̃:m] and finally *ōm* (pr. [o:m] or [õ:m]).

That *-ōm* develops by the influence of *m* seems again to be clear from the fact that in Kui, while we have for the singular suffixes *-ēnu*, *-ē*, etc., we have for the plural *-āmu* instead of *-*ēmu*.

Thus -ōm *seems to have developed from* -ām *through the combined influence of the analogy of the other pronominal forms and the labial final* m.

N.B.—Doctor Caldwell says: "*ō* is found in the plural in some connexions in Tamil and Malayāḷam, but it is derived, as I think I have shown, from *ām*."

F.—Influence of Nasals in General.

In the uncultivated dialects of Tamil, namely, Korava and Kaikāḍi and also in Modern colloquial Tamil and in Tuḷu, the influence of the nasal suffixes *n* and *m* is most seen.

In these languages the vowel followed by the nasal becomes a single nasalized sound. In some cases even the nasalization of the vowel disappears and the pure vowel alone is heard in pronunciation: cf. Tuḷu, Korava and Kaikāḍi.

In Modern colloquial Tamil *nāṉ vantēṉ* is pronounced ordinarily as [nã:vandẽ:] or [næ̃:vandẽ:] and *nām vandōm* as [nɔ̃:vandõ:]. In other words *-ēṉ* and *-ōm* are pronounced as nasalized *-ē* and *-ō* respectively.

In Korava and Kaikāḍi as also in Tuḷu, even this nasalization is lost and only the pure vowel without nasalization is heard; e.g., in Korava and Kaikāḍi the first person singular ending is *-ē*, and the first person plural is *-ō*. In Kaikāḍi beside *-ē* we have also *-i* and beside *-ō* also *-ū*. Again in Kui beside the first person singular *-ēnu* we have merely *-ē* and *-i*.

In Tuḷu the first person singular termination is *-e* and the plural is *-a*. The termination *-e* is pronounced *-æ* (vide Remark, page 47, Tuḷu Grammar by J. Brigel). The developments of *-e* and *-a* may be expressed as follows:—

(1) [æn] > [æ̃n] > [æ̃] > [æ] (written *e*).
(2) [am] > [ãm] > [ã] > [a].

N.B.—Tamil-Malayāḷam, *-om* is itself a development produced by the influence of *m*.

G.—Special Development of *æ* in Telugu.

Primitive Dravidian *æ* (the unstressed short of *ǣ* of the first person) is much affected by the law of vowel-harmony in Telugu :—after *ā̆* it becomes *a* ; after *ū̆* it becomes *u* ; after ī̆ it becomes *i*.

Thus we get three types of verbs in Telugu—

(1) those ending in *-an* or *-anu* (first person singular) and *-amu* (first person plural) ;

(2) those ending in *-un* or *-unu* (first person singular) and *-umu* (first person plural) ;

(3) those ending in *-in* or *-ini* (first person singular) and *-imi* (first person plural).

All these types are formed from the verbal participles.

There is a fourth type ending in *-ānu* (singular) and *-āmu* (plural) used in Modern Telugu. This is formed from the relative participles.

(*a*) The *a*-type.

This type includes (1) the first personal verbal nouns, (2) the old classical future tense—

The Verbal Nouns.

(1) *nēnu bīdavāḍanu* = I am a poor man.
mēmu bīdavāramu = we are poor men.

Here *bīdavāḍu* and *bīdavāru* are third personal nouns and these are converted into verbal forms by the addition of original *-*æn(u)* or *-*æmu* which by vowel-harmony with the preceding *ā* becomes *-an(u)* or *-amu*.

The Old Classical Future.

(2) *nēnu vaṇḍa(ṁ)galan* = I shall cook.
mēmu vaṇḍa(ṁ)galamu = we shall cook.

These are old classical futures which are now obsolete.

Here Primitive Dravidian first personal *-*æn* or *-*æmu* becomes *-an* or *-amu* by vowel-harmony with the preceding vowel *a* of *-gal-*.

(*b*) The *u*-type.

This type includes the 'Indefinite tense' called in Telugu 'Taddharma.'

nēnu koṭṭudunu = I would strike.
mēmu koṭṭudumu = we would strike.

Here Primitive Dravidian *-*ænu* or *-*æmu* > *-unu* or *-umu* by vowel-harmony with the preceding *u* of *-ud-*, the infix of the indefinite tense.

(*c*) THE *i*-TYPE.

This type represents the old classical past tense. This type is most common in the Ceded Districts, but is rarely used in conversation in the Circars.

nēnu vaṇḍitin or *vaṇḍitini* = I cooked.
mēmu vaṇḍitimi = we cooked.

Here *-in* (or *-ini*) and *-imi* are from -**æn* and -**æm* respectively by vowel-harmony with the *-i-* of *-it-*, the infix of the past tense.

(*d*) THE *ā*-TYPE.

This type is generally considered to be non-literary. It represents the emphatic form of the *a*-type.

Thus *-ānu* and *-āmu* are from *-anu* and *-amu* which develop from -**æn* or -**æm*. The *ā*-type develops, therefore, from the *a*-type through emphasis ; and is thus also the result of vowel-harmony.

It includes (1) the present progressive tense, (2) the habitual present tense and (3) the past tense of Modern Telugu as spoken in the Northern Circars—

(1) *Present Progressive.*

nēnu koṭṭutunnānu = I am striking.
mēmu koṭṭutunnāmu = we are striking.

Here we have *koṭṭutunna-* + *-ānu* or *-āmu*. *Koṭṭutunna* is the present progressive relative participle (vide Arden's Progressive Grammar of Telugu, page 75 and article 197). *-ānu* and *-āmu* are from *-anu* and *-amu* by emphasis. *-ănu* and *-ămu* develop from -**æn* and -**æm* by vowel-harmony with the *a* of *-unna-*. In combination, the *a* of *-unna-* drops after changing *æ* into *a* which becomes *ā* by emphasis.

Thus : *koṭṭutunna* + -**æn(u)* > *koṭṭutunna-* + *-ānu* > *koṭṭutunnānu*.

(2) *Habitual Present.*

nēnu koṭṭutānu = I strike.
mēmu koṭṭutāmu = we strike.

Here again, as in the case of the present progressive tense, we have *-ānu* or *-āmu* the emphatic forms of *-anu* or *-amu* added to the present relative participle ending in *-uta-*.

Thus : *koṭṭutānu* is from *koṭṭuta-* + *-ānu* (emphatic). *-ānu* develops from *-anu* which arises from -**æn* by vowel-harmony with the *a* of *-uta-* in * *koṭṭuta-*.†

---

† *Koṭṭuta* = *koṭṭutu* (present verbal participle) + *-a* (the relative termination).

(3) *The Past Tense.*

nènu koṭṭinānu = I struck.
mēmu koṭṭināmu = we struck.

This type of the past tense is the most common in the Northern Circars while in Cuddapah the old classical *ini*-type is used.

Koṭṭinānu is from *koṭṭina*- + -*ānu* (emphatic). The *a* of -*ina*-, the relative past participle infix, disappears after changing -**æn* or -**æm* into -*an* or -*am* which develop by emphasis into -*ānu* or -*āmu*.

N.B.—The forms *koṭṭinānu* and *koṭṭināmu* are contracted in the speech of the low class people to *koṭṭānu* and *koṭṭāmu*—vide article 719, Arden.

To sum up—

The *a*-, *u*-, and *i*-types of verbs are formed by the addition of weak personal endings -*an* (-*am*), -*un* (-*um*) or -*in* (-*im*) respectively. These develop from -**æn* or -**æm* by vowel-harmony with a preceding vowel *a*, *u*, or *i*.

Again these types are formed from the verbal participles.

On the other hand, the *ā*-types are formed by the addition of emphatic personal endings and from relative participles ending in *a*. This *a* disappears before the personal termination, but before disappearing changes -**æn* or -**æm* into -*anu* or -*amu*, which by emphasis become -*ānu* or -*āmu*.

SECTION VI.

CONCLUSION.

A.—Summary of the whole Thesis by Graphic Representation.

The Development of æ *in the Nominative and Oblique Cases and also in Verbs under normal Conditions.*

- *æ*
  - Stressed — *æ*
    - *ē* (Telugu, Kurukh and Malto).
    - *yā* (Old Tamil and Tuḷu).
    - *ā* (Kanarese, Kui and Kōlāmī) also in New Tamil in non-pronominal words.
  - Unstressed — *æ*
    - *a* (normally) in Gōṇḍī (verbs) and Kōlāmī (oblique cases and verbs).
    - *e* (Tamil, Malayāḷam, Kanarese, Tuḷu, Kui and Malto).
    - *æ*
      - *a* or *u* or *i*, by vowel-harmony in Telugu.
      - $a > \bar{a}$ by emphasis.
      - *æ* disappears before the tense infix in Kurukh.

Special Development of æ *in Verbs.*

- *æ*
  - *e*
    - *e* (unemphatic) in Old Tamil, Kanarase, Tuḷu and Malto.
    - *ē* (emphatic) in New Tamil, Old Malayāḷam and Kui.
  - *a*
    - (1) Normally in Gōṇḍī and Kōlāmī.
    - (2) before *v* or *p*, the future infix in Tamil and Old Malayāḷam.
    - (3) before the plural suffix -*m* >
      - *a* in Old Tamil and Tuḷu.
      - *ā* (emphatic)
        - *ā* Old Tamil and Kui (nouns).
        - *ō* New Tamil, Old Malayāḷam.
  - *æ*
    - *a* or *i* or *u* (Telugu) by vowel-harmony.
    - *ā* by vowel-harmony with the relative suffix *a* and the influence of accent.

APPENDIX.

THE LAW OF VOWEL-LENGTHENING IN TELUGU.

ENUNCIATION.

When in a Primitive Dravidian polysyllabic pronominal word, or any word where the vowel of the second syllable is separated from that of the first syllable by any one of the liquids _r_, _ṟ_, _l_, _ḻ_ and _ḷ_ the accent falls on the vowel of the second syllable, then in Telugu the vowel of the second syllable is first assimilated to the vowel of the first syllable (in the prehistoric period) and then lengthened with the simultaneous dropping of the unaccented vowel of the first syllable.

EXPLANATION.

1. This law applies to all the pronominal words having the accent on the second syllable.

2. It applies also to other words having _r_, _ṟ_, _l_, _ḻ_, or _ḷ_ intervening between the first and the second syllable and having the accent on the second syllable.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) The Pronominal Words.

The Primitive Dravidian pronominal words that have the accent on the second syllable are the oblique cases of all the pronouns except the interrogative pronouns, i.e., *_ad(u)_, 'it', *_id(u)_, 'this', _avai_, 'those things', _ivai_, 'these things', *_ǣn_, 'I', *_ǣm_, 'we', *_īn_, 'thou', *_īm_, 'you', _avan_, 'he,' _ivan_, 'this man', _avar_, 'they' and _ivar_, 'these men'.

These pronouns being nominative pronouns have the accent on the first syllable.

But the oblique cases of these pronouns _have the accent on the second syllable_ in accordance with the principle of balance referred to above.

(_a_) The oblique bases of *_ad(u)_ and *_id(u)_ are formed by the addition of the formative _-an_ or _-in_. Cf. Tamil _adaṉ_ (written _ataṉ_) or _adiṉ_ (written _atiṉ_) and _idaṉ_ (written _itaṉ_) or _idiṉ_ (written _itin_).

According to the law enunciated above—

adán > _dān_ in Telugu through *_ₐdán_
idín > _dīn_ in Telugu through *_ᵢdín_.

With the addition of the genitive sign *-i* of Telugu, these give *dāni* and *dini*.

(*b*) The oblique bases of *avai* and *ivai* are formed by the addition of the particle *-ar̲r̲-* or *-ir̲r̲-*.

Tamil uses, as a rule, the formative *-ar̲r̲-* and Telugu chooses *-ar̲r̲-* (> *-aṭ-*) or *-ir̲r̲-* (> *-iṭ-*) according as the initial vowel of the pronoun is *a* or *i*.

Tamil while adding the formative *-ar̲r̲-*, uses the weak forms of *avai* and *ivai*, namely, *av* and *iv*: (vide Nan̲n̲ūl, sūtra 250, and Tolkāppiyam, Eḻuttatikāram, 388).

The use of the weak forms *av* and *iv* in Tamil is consistent with the fact that *av* and *iv* are unaccented in the oblique forms.

As the result of the stress shifting from the first to the second syllable, we have *-avar̲r̲-* > *-vāṭ-*.

r̲r̲ > *ṭṭ* in Telugu and *ṭṭ* > *ṭ* after a long vowel (vide my thesis on Double Consonants). Similarly—

**ivir̲r̲-* > *viṭ-*

vāṭ- and *viṭ-* become oblique bases by the addition of the genitive sign *i*. For in Telugu the genitive is the oblique base. Hence we get *vāṭi* and *viṭi*.

(*c*) The oblique base of **æn* is **æna-* and of **æm* is **æma-*: compare Tamil *en̲a-* and *ema-*.

The oblique of **in* is **ina-* and of **im* is **ima-*.

**ina-* and **ima-* > in Telugu **ini* and **imi* by vowel-harmony.

When the accent shifts on to the second syllable in the oblique cases **æna-* > *nā-* ; *æma-* > *mā-* ; **ini* > *nī* ; **imi* > *mi* in Telugu in accordance with the law above enunciated.

It is thus clear that the operation of the law of vowel-harmony is anterior to the effect of accent change.

(*d*) *avan-* and *avar-* become *vān-* and *vār-* in the oblique case and with the genitive termination *-i* the full oblique bases of these pronouns in Telugu are *vāni* and *vāri*.

ivan- and *ivar-* first become **ivin-* and **ivir-* by vowel-harmony and then change to *vin-* and *vir-*. These with the genitive ending *-i* give *vini* and *viri* in Telugu.

(*e*) The nominative demonstratives *avan*, *ivan*, *avar* and *ivar* have the accent on the initial vowel as stated above. Hence these should give us the forms **ava*(*ṃ*)*ḍu*, **iva*(*ṃ*)*ḍu*, **avaru* and **ivaru* in Telugu. But though the influence of the oblique forms, we have *vā*(*ṃ*)*ḍu* and *vi*(*ṃ*)*ḍu* pronounced [vā̃ :dŭ] and [vĩ:dŭ] (also [vā:dŭ] and [vī:dŭ]) respectively, and not **ava*(*m*)*ḍu*, **iva*(*m*)*ḍu*. Again *vāru* and *viru* have taken the place of **avaru* and **ivaru*.

The following tables illustrate in a graphic manner the full development of the *long vowels* in the Telugu pronominal words through the influence of the accent change :—

adan-	Non-Telugu ...	*adaṉ-* (Tamil) (written *ataṉ-*).
	Telugu ...	*$_{a}$*dán* -> *dā́n-* and (with genitive *-i*) *dā́ni*
idin-	Non-Telugu ...	*idiṉ-* (Tamil) (written *itiṉ-*).
	Telugu ...	*$_{i}$*din-* > *dī́n-* and (with genitive *-i*) *dī́ni*.
avaṟṟ-	Non-Telugu ...	*avaṟṟ-* (Tamil).
	Telugu ...	*$_{a}$*vaṭṭ-* > *vā́ṭ-* and (with genitive *-i*) *vāṭi*.
ivaṟṟ-	Non-Telugu ...	*ivaṟṟ-* (Tamil).
	Telugu ...	*$_{i}$*viṭṭ-* > *vī́ṭ-* and (with genitive *-i*) *vīṭi*.
* *æna-*	Non-Telugu ...	*ena-*, Tamil, Malayāḷam and Kanarese.
	Telugu ...	*$_{æ}$*na-* > *nā́-*.
**æma-*	Non-Telugu ...	*ema-*, Tamil, Malayāḷam and Kanarese.
	Telugu ...	*$_{æ}$*ma-* > *mā́-*.
**ina-*	Non-Telugu ...	*uṉ-* (Tamil ?)
	Telugu ...	**ine* > **íni* > *$_{i}$*ní* > *nī́*.
**ima-*	Non-Telugu ...	*um-* (Tamil)?
	Telugu ...	**ime* > **ími* > *$_{i}$*mí* > *mī́*.
avan-	Non-Telugu oblique ...	*avaṉ-* (Tamil).
	Telugu oblique ...	*$_{a}$*van-* > *vā́n-* and (with genitive *-i*) *vāni*.
avar-	Non-Telugu oblique ...	*avar-* (Tamil).
	Telugu oblique ...	*$_{a}$*var-* > *vā́r-* and (with genitive *-i*) *vāri*.
ivan-	Non-Telugu oblique ...	*ivaṉ-* (Tamil).
	Telugu oblique ...	**iven-* > **ívin-* > *$_{i}$*vín-* > *vī́n-* and (with genitive *-i*) *vīni*.
ivar-	Non-Telugu oblique ...	*ivar-* (Tamil).
	Telugu oblique ...	**iver-* > **ívir-* > *$_{i}$*vír-* > *vī́r-* and (with genitive *-i*) *vīri*.

NOTE.

Interrogative Bases.

The interrogative pronouns, whether they are in the nominative or in the oblique case, have naturally the stress on the syllable which contains the interrogative base ; and

this syllable is invariably the first in every interrogative pronominal word.

As a result of the stress resting on it, the vowel of the first syllable often becomes long.

In Tamil beside *e*, we have also *ē* and *yā*. In Malayāḷam and Kanarese we have only the emphatic accented forms: Malayāḷam has *ē* and Kanarese has *yā*. In Telugu beside *e* (which is Old Telugu) we have in New Telugu *ē*. Sometimes in Telugu instead of vowel-lengthening through emphasis, we have also consonant-lengthening in the first syllable, e.g., *ev*, *ēv*, or *evv*.

Thus—

In Tamil, beside *evaṉ*, *evaḷ*, *edu*, *evai* and *evar*, we have also *ēvaṉ*, *ēvaḷ*, *ēdu*, *ēvai*, *ēvar* and also *yāvaṉ*, *yāvaḷ*, *yādu*, *yāvai* and *yāvar*.

In Malayāḷam, we have only the emphatic long forms *ēvan*, *ēvaḷ*, *ēdu*, *ēva* and *ēvar*.

In Kanarese, only the emphatic forms *yāvanu* (= *āvanu*), *yāvaḷu* (= *āvaḷu*), *yāvadu* (= *āvadu*), *yāru* (= *āru*), *yāvavu* (= *āvuvu*).

N.B.—Kanarese *yā* and *ā* < original open *ē*.

In Telugu, we have beside *evaḍu*, *edi*, *evaru* and *evi*, also *evvaḍu*, *evvaru*, *ēvāḍu*, *ēvāru*, *ēḍu*, *ēdi* and *ēvi* (vide Arden's Telugu Grammar, section 772).

Mr. Seshagiri Rao tells me that the following forms with *y* are found in the Nellore Inscriptions:—*yavvaru* O. 17-2 (1227-28); *yavvaraina* D. 57 (1219-20).]

In Telugu, however, the interrogative neuters (singular and plural) are affected by analogy, and hence we have the vowel of the second syllable lengthened.

Thus beside *ēdāni* we have New Telugu *dēni*; beside *ēvāni* we have *vēni*. That the accent tended by analogy to change to the second syllable is seen by the length of the vowel in the second syllable of words like *ēvāḍu*, *evvāḍu*, *ēdāni*, *eddāni*, etc. It is also likely that *ēvāḍu*, *ēdāni*, etc., are formed by the influence of forms like *vāḍu*, *dāni*, etc.

The forms *dēni* and *vēni* are comparatively late forms. *vēṭi* though the regular oblique of *ēvi* is found only in the colloquial speech. The literary oblique is *ēvāni*.

ēvāni is very likely an extension of the masculine oblique form to the neuter declension. For *ēvāni* means not only 'of whom' but also 'of which (things).' *vēṭi* is the regular oblique of *ēvi*, having the accent on *ē*: compare Tamil *evaṟṟ*. The stem corresponding to *evaṟṟ*- in Telugu developed through **eveṭ*- and *$_{e}$*véṭ* into *vēṭ*-. *vēṭ*- takes the genitive ending -*i* and becomes *vēṭi*. (*ṟṟ* > *ṭ*, vide my thesis on Double Consonants).

Primitive Dravidian *ed(u)*.

- Non-Telugu—*etu* (= *edu*) Tamil; *ētu*, Malayāḷam; *yāvadu*, Kanarese.
- Telugu.
  - Old Telugu.
    - Nominative—*edi, eddi, ēdi, ēyadi, eyyadi.*
    - Oblique—*ēdāni, eddāni.*
  - New Telugu.
    - Nominative—*ēdi.*
    - Oblique—*dēni.*

Primitive Dravidian *evai*.

- Non-Telugu—*evai,* Tamil; *ēva,* Malayāḷam; *yāva*, Kanarese.
- Telugu
  - Old Telugu.
    - Nominative—*evi, evvi, eyyavi, ēvi, ēyavi.*
    - Oblique—*evvāni* and *ēvāni*, also *vēni.*
  - New Telugu.
    - Nominative—*ēvi.*
    - Oblique—*vēni* and *vēṭi.*

(B) Words with an intervening liquid.

These are all non-pronominal words. The intervening liquids are *r*, *ṟ*, *ḻ*, and *ḷ*. These become in Telugu r or l—

ḻ > mostly *r*, sometimes *l*.
ḷ > *l*.
ṟ > *r*.

When one of these liquids intervenes between the vowel of the first syllable and the vowel of the second syllable, the vowel of the second syllable is first assimilated to the vowel of the first syllable and then by the accent shifting on to the third syllable, the vowel of the second syllable is lengthened with the simultaneous dropping of the vowel of the first syllable.

For instance—

eḻu (to rise) > **elé* > *$_{e}$*lé* > *lḗ*
ural (mortar) > **oral* (cf. colloquial Tamil) > **orol* > *$_{o}$*ról* >*rṓlu*, and so on.

Thus the law of vowel-lengthening in Telugu operates subsequent to the period of operation of the law of *a*-umlaut in Kanarese and Telugu (vide my Phonology, page 2).

The following table gives nearly all the words in Telugu with an intervening liquid :—

Tamil.	Malayāḷam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.
1. arai = to rub	arayuka	...	areñcuni.	rāyu, rācu
2. arayaṉ = a king	arayan	...	...	rēḍu ; rāyadu
3. irā = night	iravu	...	..	rē, rēi
4. iladi = a deer	...	...	eraḷe (?)	lēḍi
5. iḷa = tender	iḷa	eḷa	eḷe, lattu (< iḷadu)	lē
6. ural = a mortar	ural	oralu	...	rōlu
7. uḷam = in	uḷḷam	...	...	lōnu
uḷ	uḷ	oḷ, uḷ	uḷa	lō

Tamil.			Malayālam.	Kanarese.	Tuḷu.	Telugu.
8. e̲lu	=	to rise ...	e̲luka ...	e̲lu, eḷu ...	éḷege (n.). lakku (v.)	lē
9. kural	=	a sound (voice)	kural ...	koral ...	...	krōlu
10. turattu	=	to chase ...	...	..	...	trōcu
11. tu̲rai	=	a way ..	tu̲ra ...	to̲re ...	tara (?) ...	trōva
12. pa̲la	=	old ...	pa̲la ...	pa̲la, paḷa, haḷa.	para ...	prā
13. maral	=	dizziness ...	maraḷ ...	maral = to turn back	...	mrâlu (= to be fatigued); maralu (= to turn back)
14. maram	=	a tree ...	maram ...	mara ...	mara ...	mrânu; cf. mara [*odise* mara = wood of the oḍise tree. This compound preserves the older short form.]
15. me̲luku	=	to smear ...	me̲lukuka	...	...	mrēgu
16. muraṭu	=	a stump of a tree	muraṭu ...	moraḍu ...	...	mrōḍu; moraḍu
17. mu̲laṅku	=	to sound ...	mu̲laṅṅuka	mo̲lagu ...	...	mrōgu (moragu = the barking of a dog)
18. viral	=	a finger ...	viral ...	biralu ...	bireḷu ...	vrēlu
19. varai	=	to write ..	varekka ...	bare ...	bare ...	vrāyu

The following chart is intended to exhibit, in a form which may be easily surveyed, the distribution of some of the important peculiarities common to several languages. The presence of a given peculiarity is indicated by a cross opposite the name of the language; and the circle intimates some reservation of that peculiarity.

Chart I.

	First person singular nominative.						First person plural nominative.								Oblique singular and plural.							Verbal terminations.								
—	ǣn.	ānu.	ēnū.	ñān.	nān(u).	nēnu.	ǣm.	āmu.	ēmu.	ñām.	nām.	nēmu.	Short plural.	Double plural with kaḷ.	en-.	nā-.	em-.	mā-.	nan-.	nam-.	Double plural oblique.	-en.	-ēn.	-an.	-ān.	-em.	-ēm.	-ām.	-am.	ŏm.
Tamil ...	+				+		+				+			+	+		+			+		+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
Malayāḷam.				+						O	+		+	+	+					+	+		+	+						+
Tuḷu ...	+						O				O		+	+	+		O			+	+	O							O	
Kanarese ...		+			+			+			+				+		+		+	+		+	O			+				
Kui ...		+						+								+		+					+		O			+		
Kōlāmī ...		+						+														O		+					+	O
Gōṇḍī ...																+		+						+						O
Kurukh ...			+						+		+				O		+			+			O	+		O			+	O
Malto ...			+						+		+				+		+			+		+				+				
Telugu ...			+			+			+			+				+		+						+	+			+		

REMARKS.

The copious material presented by the cultivated and uncultivated languages of the Dravidian group with regard to the pronouns and the pronominal terminations of the verb has been handled by Mr. Subbaiya with great care and with great thoroughness, and I feel that his treatment of this subject evinces a right feeling for the ways of language. But this is a subject beset with great difficulties and much more will have to be done before every problem which it presents is finally solved. One notes with great satisfaction the presence in this article of new ideas and suggestions. These are always welcome, even if they serve but as stepping-stones to higher or more accurate expressions for the laws that govern any particular set of linguistic phenomena. Some of these call for special notice.

Mr. Subbaiya adduces instances to show that in Dravidian a nasal at the end of a monosyllabic word beginning with a vowel may, after first nasalising the vowel, produce a nasal at the beginning of the word. The assumption of such a principle seems to me to be not unreasonable. But I feel that it needs to be pointed out that there is a very great number of words ending in a nasal in which no such initial nasal has been developed. The suggested principle has certainly very considerable limitations. According to the examples given (pages 21–22), for instance, no such phenomenon appears to be observable in Telugu or Kanarese. For this reason alone I should hesitate to consider such a principle, as Mr. Subbaiya does, a sufficient explanation of the origin of the initial nasal in the pronouns of the first person singular and plural. But, apart from this consideration, it is difficult on this assumption —unless it could be shown that they are chronological or dialectal variants, which, of course, is not impossible—to account for the existence of forms with an initial nasal and forms without side by side in one and the same language, as, e.g., *yām* and *nām*, 'we,' both in Old Tamil and in Modern literary Tamil. Moreover the assumption leaves unexplained the curious difference between the initial nasal of the singular (*ñāṉ*, 'I') and that of the plural (*nām*, 'we') in Malayāḷam. We should have expected both to show the same nasal, either *ñ* or *n*. The evidence as contained in Mr. Subbaiya's table of the pronouns of the first person in Dravidian (page 10), I would suggest, points to the plural as the source—or one of the sources—from which the singular received its initial nasal. The indication seems to be that at a certain period of the original Dravidian language there were two distinct pronouns of the first person plural (apparently an inclusive and an exclusive), one with and one without an initial nasal.

The double form in the plural appears to have produced a corresponding double form in the singular. That is to say, the originally unnasalised singular pronoun was supplemented (in those languages which show two forms) by a nasalised pronoun under the influence of the plural which possessed both a nasalised and an unnasalised form; for example, in Tamil, the form *nāṉ*, 'I,' I suggest, arose by the side of the form *yāṉ* under the influence of the pair *nām—yām*, 'we'. Such an innovation would be rendered all the easier (1) if the distinction between inclusive and exclusive forms in the plural had become blurred and (2) if the plural was frequently used, as it is in modern spoken Tamil, for the singular.

On the other hand I am quite in sympathy with Mr. Subbaiya's explanation of the initial *y* of *yāṉ*, 'I,' and *yām*, 'we,' in Tamil as developed out of an open *ē*, i.e., an *ē* whose pronunciation lies between that of close *ē*, (e.g. the long of the *e* in *get*) and that of *ā*. Old Bulgarian presents what appears to be a precisely parallel phenomenon. This language shows a prothetic *y* (better, *i̯*) before all palatal vowels; for instance, *yestŭ* corresponds to Lithuanian *ẽsti*, Sanskrit *asti*, 'is.' This prothetic semi-vowel, which is in the nature of an on-glide, is to be compared with what one finds in the pronunciation of palatal vowels in Dravidian, although in this case the semi-vowel is not (usually) expressed in writing. Now Lithuanian *ė́sti*, 'to eat,' is represented in Old Bulgarian by *yāsti*. Here, as in numerous other instances, an open *ē*, pronounced *i̯ē*, has passed into *ā* and carried with it the prothetic semivowel, thus producing *i̯ā*. Similarly it would seem that an original * *i̯ēṉ* in Tamil (cp. the termination of the first person singular in verbs) developed gradually into *i̯āṉ* (*yāṉ*) in which the initial semi-vowel proper to the palatal vowel *ē* has been retained. Old Bulgarian certainly shows that such an explanation is phonetically possible. But we may go a step further. This explanation helps us not only to understand the relation between Tamil *yāṉ* and the corresponding Telugu *ēnu*, but it throws light upon all cases in which Tamil *yā-* is answered in Telugu by *ē-*, such as *yāṉai*, 'elephant,' by the side of Telugu *ēni-ka*, *yāṭṻ*, 'sheep' by the side of Telugu *ēḍi-ka*, 'ram,' etc. The solution which has been adopted by Mr. Subbaiya seems, therefore, not only possible, but highly probable.

It is dangerous to base the interpretation of the facts of language on solely phonetic considerations. Mr. Subbaiya's treatment of the termination of the first person plural in the verb, though it is ingenious and shows careful thought, is weakened to a large extent, in my opinion, by such a procedure. He argues on a priori phonetic possibilities without

making it clear, by means of parallel instances, for instance, that such phonetic possibilities have any right to be regarded as operative in the languages with which he is dealing. I refer to his explanation of the Modern Tamil termination of the first person plural in *-ōm*. Mr. Subbaiya would derive this from the termination *-ām* found in early Tamil, and in this I am quite willing to agree with him, and I agree, too, that this change may have been aided by the presence of final *m*. But if this is so, what are we to say to forms like *nām*, where no such modification of the vowel has taken place? The answer which I would give is that the *ā* of the suffix *-ām* is of a different nature from that of the pronoun *nām*. The latter, as Mr. Subbaiya points out, is in all probability a development of an original *ē*. I doubt very seriously whether a similar origin can be assigned to the *ā* of the termination *-ām*. One needs to show that such a change is not only theoretically possible (cp. Old English *móna* by the side of Gothic *mēna*, 'moon') but that it actually took place in other words or categories of words; or at least that it is not at variance with other phenomena presented by the language or languages concerned. Moreover it seems to me too much to demand that in Tamil the final *m* of the pronoun of the first person plural (like the final *ṉ* of the pronoun of the first person singular) should have induced an initial nasal, as Mr. Subbaiya suggests, but should have had no very potent effect upon the preceding vowel, and that the same final *m* in the termination of the first person plural of the verb should have changed the same (original) vowel into *ō*.† I admit that Mr. Subbaiya's endeavour to discover a basic unity underlying these expressions for the first person plural, not only in Tamil, but for the whole Dravidic group, is a laudable one; but I do not think that he has established his position. I am not prepared to offer a definite solution of this difficult problem. But one thing appears to me extremely probable, namely, that, as in the pronoun so in the verb, we have to see an original distinction—whatever confusion or simplification may have taken place later—between an inclusive and an exclusive plural. In early Tamil the termination *-ēm* was exclusive, as, indeed, one might have expected from its being the natural plural of the singular termination *-ēṉ*. The termination *ām*, on the other hand, is said by the grammarians to have been inclusive. The *ā* of this termination, I have already suggested,

† Mr. Subbaiya, it is true, mentions the possibility of another phonetic factor, namely, the influence of other forms which show at an earlier period an *ō*-vowel; e.g., the third person singular in *-ōn* (masculine) and *ōl* (feminine).

was very different from the *ā* (derived from *ẹ*, or *ae*) of the pronoun *yām* (*nām*). I conceive it to have been very open, i.e. approximating to an *ŏ*-sound, and therefore passing readily into such a sound. Modern Tamil has entirely rejected the form within *e*-tonality, and it seems to me that the same selective principle has been at work throughout the Dravidic group. Kanarese has retained the *e*-form; Malayāḷam, like Tamil, the *o*-form only. Among the uncultivated members of the group the *a*-forms seem to prevail; the plural is here clearly differentiated from the singular, which shows prevailingly an *e*-tonality, but has retained only what I assume to be the earlier tonality of an original inclusive form. It is, of course, possible that the *e*-forms in early Tamil and in Kanarese may be relatively modern innovations formed on the analogy of the corresponding singular form. But since the earliest Tamil documents show both *a*-forms and *e*-forms in the plural, I cannot resist the interpretation that we are to see behind these variants an original difference of function, namely, as I would suggest, that the *e*-forms connoted the exclusive, the *a*- (or *o*-) forms connoted the inclusive plural. It need hardly be said that there remains much to be elaborated before any final solution of this problem can be arrived at.

Mr. Subbaiya's remarks on the special development of original *æ* (i.e., open *e*) in Telugu in connexion with these terminations seems to me on the whole satisfactory. But I hesitate to acquiesce entirely in his view of the *ā*-type of termination (page 36). In particular, in the case of forms like *koṭṭinānu*, *koṭṭināmu*, it should be borne in mind that Tamil seems to present exactly the same type. Any explanation of this type should make it clear why the ending of the first person singular is *-ānu* in Telugu *(pōyinānu)* but *-ēṉ* in Tamil *(pōyiṉ -ēṉ)*. If *-a+aen* developed in Telugu, under the influence of vowel-harmony followed by the loss of *-a*, into *-an*, which then becomes *-ān* (pages 37–38), what, I would ask, were the influences at work in Tamil which caused the same *-a+aen* to apparently develop into *e-ṉ* and *-ēṉ*? It might, of course, be suggested that the difference of development is due to the absence of vowel-harmony in Tamil. This is not impossible, but I would point out that in early Telugu—and it must not be forgotten that these formations seem to go back to a great antiquity—vowel-harmony plays a very insignificant part. I feel, moreover, that one has little right to assume, without special comment and without adducing any parallel instances, that *-aṉ* in Tamil developed under (an assumed) stress into *-āṉ*. Mr. Subbaiya admits for the parent language the existence of emphatic and unemphatic forms side by side (page 31). I would suggest that

it is much more natural to assume that a full form should become weak than that a weak form should become full. Still, I will not deny the possibility of the latter change taking place.

Mr. Subbaiya's treatment of the oblique forms of the pronouns, in connexion with his 'law of vowel-lengthening in Telugu', seems to me to be distinctly a step in the right direction. I accept the principle adopted; but in some few cases I think the details need revision. For instance, it seems clear to me that Tamil *av-ai* (cp. Telugu *av-i*) by the side of *av-iṟṟŭ* points to a demonstrative base *av-*, such as one sees in Tamil *av-aṉ*. Mr. Subbaiya calls *av* the weak form of *av-ai* (page 41). I feel that this is not a correct view. I hesitate further—at least, at present—to regard the final *-a* of **æna-*, **æma-*, **ına-*, **ima-*, the original forms of the oblique bases of the pronouns of the first and second persons, respectively, according to Mr. Subbaiya, as a formative element (page 25). There is but little trace of any such formative element elsewhere. Nevertheless, even if some other interpretation of this *-a* has eventually to be adopted, I am strongly of opinion that at least the derivation of the oblique forms *nā* and *mā* of the first person singular and plural in Telugu (and elsewhere) from an original dissyllabic base, borne out as this suggestion is by so many parallel examples, will hardly be overthrown. I myself have been inclined to regard the form **ena-* (or **aena-*), preserved as it seems to me in such forms as Tamil *eṉa-kku*, as the base from which (according to difference of stress, as I imagine) both the nominative stem on the one hand (e.g., Telugu *ēnu*) and the oblique stem on the other (Telugu *nā*) developed. But I prefer to leave this and similar parallel suggestions with regard to the pronouns and verbal terminations for maturer consideration.

The oblique interrogative forms in classical Telugu *ē-vāni*, 'whose' (singular masculine) and *ē-dāni*, 'whose' (singular neuter), seem clearly to be new formations modelled on the oblique forms *vāni*, 'of him,' *dāni*, 'of it,' the necessity for such remodelling arising from the fact that the phonetically regular forms *vēni*, *dēni* had lost the vowel characteristic of the interrogative pronoun.

M. COLLINS.

SANSKRITIC ELEMENT IN THE VOCABULARIES OF THE DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Sanskritic element in the vocabularies of the Dravidian languages is so large that it has often been urged with much show of reason by orthodox paṇdits that Dravidian languages can claim no originality independent of Sanskrit, that, in other words, Sanskrit is the mother of the South Indian languages. This is only the popular view shared by illiterate people along with the orthodox paṇdits whose learning knows no analysis nor comparison. Grammarians of the Dravidian languages have clearly pointed out that the languages they deal with are different from Sanskrit. The grammarian of each language has indicated in a way that there is the Dravidian language pure to be differentiated from Sanskrit. Thus, the Tamil grammarian (the author of the Naṉṉūl) frames certain rules to govern the words imported from Sanskrit. The Telugu grammarian (Kētana, the author of the Āndhra-bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇamu) differentiates the pure Telugu words from Sanskrit words. The Kanarese grammarian (Kēśirāja, the author of the Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam) devotes a whole chapter (Ch. VII) to the tadbhavas. Maḷayāḷam grammar is recent, and the author of the Kērala-Pāṇinīyam (published in 1896) makes such a distinction (p. 335).

But none of these, except the last, who had the benefit of western learning and of the researches made by orientalists like Dr. Gundert and Dr. Caldwell in the nineteenth century recognized the relation of the Dravidian languages to each other. Tamil grammarians, for instance, regarded Telugu words and even Malayāḷam words as *ticaiccol*, 'words from other quarters.' They divided words into three classes: (1) pure Tamil words, (2) Sanskrit words, and (3) *ticaiccol*. This classification would group all foreign words, together, Arabic, Persian, Telugu, Malayāḷam, Tuḷu, Kanarese, etc. This classification was of course unscientific. When a certain word that was not found in Tamil literature or used by the Tamil-speaking people, happened to be employed by

an author perhaps owing to his contact with, say, the Telugu people, it was set down as a Telugu word and a *ticaiccol*. One cannot deny that there were people at various times conversant with more than one of the Dravidian languages. Still it was not before Dr. Gundert, Dr. Caldwell, and other European scholars pointed it out that it was recognized that Tamil, Telugu, Kanarese and Malayāḷam were sister-languages and that they all belonged to the same stock that may be termed Dravidian.

In olden times Sanskrit was looked upon with such great respect that it led to the popular belief that it was a divine language, the language of the gods (compare the Tamil name for Sanskrit, *girvāṇam*). Even scholars looked up to it for solution of all intricate problems in all departments of knowledge. Kētana or Abhinavadaṇḍin, the author of perhaps the earliest Telugu grammar Āndhra-bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇamu, a work unquestionably of the thirteenth century, accepts that Sanskrit is the mother of all languages (verse 13). Another Telugu grammar, the Nannaya-bhaṭṭīyamu, for which is claimed an earlier date but which has been proved to be a spurious work by Mr. Veeresalingam Pantulu in his Lives of Telugu Poets, is written in Sanskrit. It was wrongly ascribed to the great Nannaya Bhaṭṭa, the author of the Telugu Bhārata. The earliest Kanarese grammar, the Karṇāṭaka-bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇam, was written in Sanskrit by Nāga Varma whose date according to B. L. Rice is 1070—1120. (Introduction to the Karṇāṭaka-śabdānuśāsanam.) He wrote a *vṛtti* for it also in Sanskrit. Bhaṭṭākalaṅka Dēva completed in 1604 his exhaustive grammar of Kanarese in Sanskrit sūtras, the Karṇaṭaka-śabdānuśāsanam by name, with a commentary, also in Sanskrit, called Bhāṣā-mañjarī, and a further voluminous commentary on the latter, in the same language, called Mañjarī-makarandaḥ. Even in modern times, Rājarāja Varma, the author of the Kēraḷa-Pāṇinīyam, named his work after the great Sanskrit grammarian. In Tamil, Svāminātha Dēśikar, who wrote his Ilakkaṇakkottu to explain, as a grammar of grammars, the intricacies of Tamil grammar, goes out of the way in his introduction to the work to praise Sanskrit and cry down Tamil. Says he : "To Tamil works there is no limit. But is there one among them that is written in pure Tamil? Besides, wise men will hesitate to even mention that there is a language formed of five letters. So do I, understand. Grammar is the same for Sanskrit and Tamil." By the five letters the author means *e, o, ḻ, ṟ, ṉ*, not found in the Sanskrit alphabet. Another author, Subrahmaṇya Dīkṣitar, a contemporary and fellow-scholar of Svāminātha Dēśikar, derives the name of the language *tamil,* from a Sanskrit word *drāviḍa*. His work, the Prayōga-vivēkam, was written to explain the application of Sanskrit grammar to Tamil literature. These authors flourished in the seventeenth century.

The earlier Tamil grammarians, however, did not hold this extreme view. They, no doubt, ascribed sanctity to Sanskrit, but this did not make them lose their regard for their own language. It is remarkable that there is no Tamil grammar written in Sanskrit as in the case of Telugu or Kanarese. People may be found even to-day who hold that Tamil is in no way inferior to Sanskrit, that the God Śiva was the author of Tamil as well as of Sanskrit, that while he taught the Sanskrit grammar to Pāṇini, he taught the Tamil grammar to Agastya, by no means a less renowned sage. Parañcōti Munivar's Tiruviḷaiyāṭaṟpurāṇam, and Śivajñāna Yōgi's Kāñcippurāṇam have verses endorsing this view.

In spite of their high regard for Sanskrit or their false view in respect of the relation of Sanskrit to the Dravidian languages, the grammarians of the Dravidian languages have differentiated Sanskrit words from the Dravidian, and some of them have reduced the changes which Sanskrit words undergo in the Dravidian languages to certain rules. The Tolkāppiyam, the earliest Tamil grammar extant, which cannot be assigned to any period later than the first century B.C. even by the severest critic of Tamil literature, is silent on the question of the Sanskritic origin of the Tamil language and even on its relation to the other Dravidian languages, but speaks of two classes of loan-words borrowed from Sanskrit, one the tatsamas so-called, and the other tadbhavas (Tolkāppiyam, Collatikāram, sūtram 401 and sūtram 402). All words found in Tamil Tolkāppiyar divided into (1) *iyaṟcol*, 'plain words employed in ordinary speech,' (2) *tiricol*, 'words employed only in literary works,' (3) *ticaiccol*, 'words borrowed from languages spoken all around', and (4) *vaṭacol*, 'the speech of the North, or Sanskrit words.' In dealing with *vaṭacol*, the grammarian speaks first of the borrowings in which the letters peculiar to Sanskrit do not appear, and then of corrupted words. The first class I named tatsamas and the other tadbhavas following the terminology of later times. A commentator of the Naṉṉūl employs these words. Tatsamas he explains as words formed of letters common to Sanskrit and Tamil. This definition, of course, must be modified in the case of Telugu or Kanarese or even Malayāḷam in consideration of the fact that these languages have a fuller alphabet, and 'common' is meaningless with them. They can bodily adopt the Sanskrit words without any change whatever except perhaps in the case of terminations peculiar to Sanskrit. Tadbhavas he explains as words formed of letters peculiar to Sanskrit as well as those common to Sanskrit and Tamil, and corrupted to a greater or less extent from the original Sanskrit. This definition will apply to the tadbhavas in the other Dravidian languages above-named, only the question of letters is meaningless. Tadbhavas are corrupted Sanskrit words. Dr. Pope translates tatsamas as unmodified words and tadbhavas

as modified words (A larger Grammar of the Tamil Language in both its dialects, 1859).

The Kanarese grammars come next in point of antiquity. Dr. Kittel in his Kannaḍa Grammar (p. 432) has given a classification of words accepted by Kēśava, the author of the Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam, and his learned predecessors. He says: "The Kannaḍa language consists (1) of words that are peculiar to the country (*dēśiyas)* or are pure Kannaḍa (*accagannaḍa*); (2) of words that have been borrowed from Saṃskṛta without any alteration (*samasaṃskṛtas*); (3) of words that have been more or less corrupted from Saṃskṛta (*apabhraṃśas* or *tadbhavas*), regarding which it is to be remarked that they may also (in speaking or writing) be used in their original form; (4) of some words (about 21) that exist in Kannaḍa as well as in Saṃskṛta (*tatsamas* and compounds with them), or are, as it were, Kannaḍa and Saṃskṛta." The Kanarese grammarians seem to have employed *tatsama* in a peculiar sense: some tatsamas mentioned are *aṅgaṇa, gōṇi, taḷa, bala, mañca, maṇi, māle.* The tatsamas of Telugu and Malayāḷam would correspond to the *samasaṃskṛtas* of Kanarese. Tamil tatsamas also would come under the same category with the limitations already pointed out. The Kanarese grammarians do not seem to have recognized what in Tamil are called *ticaiccol* unless they regarded them as *deśiyas.*

The Telugu grammarians have classified words in a similar way. The Āndhra-bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇamu, for instance, divides them into (1) tatsama, e.g., *vanamu, puruṣuḍu*; (2) tadbhava, e.g., *lacci* (S. *lakṣmī-*), *vivvaccuḍu* (S. *bībhatsu-*); (3) *accatenugu*, e.g., *tala, guḍi*; (4) *dēśya*, e.g., *inti, makkuva*; and (5) *grāmya*, e.g., *yiḍu, yinuti* (verses 18—25). Tatsama and tadbhava apply to Sanskrit. Of the other three divisions, *accatenugu* corresponds to *accagannaḍa, dēśya* corresponds to the *dēśiyas* of Kanarese in the sense of provincialisms, and the third *grāmya* is included in either of the above in Kanarese and denotes the vocabulary of the illiterate.

Cinnayya Sūri, in his Bālavyākaraṇamu (edition of 1910, page 6), gives two kinds of tatsamas, (1) tatsamas borrowed direct from Sanskrit: S. *rāma-*, Te. *rāmuḍu*; S. *bhū-*, Te. *bhuvi*; and (2) tatsamas derived through Prakrit: S. *agni-*, Pr. *aggi*, Te. *aggi*; S. *rājñi-*, Pr. *rāṇī*, Te. *rāṇi.* He gives also two kinds of tadbhavas, (1) tadbhavas borrowed direct from Sanskrit: S. *ākāśa-*, Te. *ākasamu*; S. *sūci-*, Te. *sūdi*, and (2) tadbhavas derived through Prakrit: S. *pṛthivī-*, Pr. *puḍhavī*, Te. *puḍami*; S. *lakṣmi-*, Pr. *lacchī*, Te. *lacci.* The remaining three appear in another form in his classification (1) *dēśya*, probably denoting all Dravidian words in general, (2) *grāmya*, ungrammatical language, and (3) *grāhya*, elegant usage.

The author of the Kērala-Pāṇinīyam, in his Śabda-śōdhinī (fourth edition, 1910, page 131) gives an exhaustive classification of Malayāḷam words,

(1) ābhyantaram (indigenous)

svantam (own)	sādhāraṇam	dēśyam (provincial)
e.g., *aṇḍi, pōṟṟi*	e.g., *maḻa* (Ta., Ka.) *cippi* (Ta., Ka., Te.)	e.g., *appa, paḷutara*

(2) bāhyam

tatsamam
e.g., *sukham, daya, manassu* (from Sanskrit)
jaldī (from Persian), and *klāśu*, 'class' (from English)

tadbhavam

prakṛti	vikṛti
S. *rājan-*	*aracan*
S. *piśāca-*	*pē*
S. *śāstar-*	*cāttan*
Eng. *hearing*	*īraṅki*
Eng. *hospital*	*āspatri*
Eng. *France*	*paraṅki*

The authors of the Vyākaraṇa-mitram (second edition, 1908, p. 184) divide the words in almost a similar way:—

Malayāḷam ... { 1. svantam, e.g., *āḻca, eta.*
2. ābhyantaram, e.g., *eli, kāṭu.*

Vaidēśikam ... { 1. tatsamas.
2. tadbhavas.

Vaidēśikas denote words derived from Sanskrit, Arabic, Hindustani, Persian, Syrian, Portuguese, and English. Tadbhavas are words that have been altered to suit the genius of Malayāḷam, and tatsamas are those that have not been thus altered, but are pronounced as they are found in the original language. Thus the Malayāḷam grammarians classed Sanskrit words with words from foreign languages, and did not accord them the dignity that the Tamil grammarians or the grammarians of Telugu and Kanarese accorded them. That is but natural in this age of western culture.

In thus reviewing the classifications of words by the indigenous grammarians, we have seen that only the Kanarese grammarian ventured to suggest that certain words found in Kannaḍa as well as in Sanskrit were common to both, that in other words, the Kannaḍa words far from being derived from Sanskrit, have been borrowed by Sanskrit. For the other grammarians the criterion must have been, as it is even to-day for the learned paṇḍits, that the fact of a certain word being found in the Sanskrit lexicon sets it down as Sanskrit. It is sacrilege to think that the divine Sanskrit has to borrow words from any human language.

The author of the Prayōga-vivēkam admits, however, that *maṇalūrpuram* in the Sanskrit Vyāsa-bhārata is a *dēśika* word. By the way it may be mentioned that he regards as pure Tamil words the names of two months *Āṭi* and *Tai* which correspond, as

tadbhavas, to the Sanskrit months Āṣāḍhā and Taiṣa respectively. Naccinārkkiṉiyar, the great commentator, in his commentary on the Tolkāppiyam (Collatikāram, p. 45) contends though with little reason that *ulakam* and *kālam* are pure Tamil words. For he says, "the author would not exemplify a rule by citing Sanskrit words." Yet, as a matter of fact, there are following these *teyvam* (S. *daiva-*), and *pūtam* (S. *bhūta-*), which are clearly Sanskrit words. It is interesting to see that *mīnam* did not strike this Naccinārkkiṉiyar as a Sanskritized Tamil word *mīn* (Tolkāppiyam, collatikāram, p. 233). Even Sanskrit writers regarded it as a Drāviḍa word, i.e., a Tamil word (Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's Tantravārttika).

Again, we have in Tamil so many as ten lexicons (nighaṇṭus) or dictionaries in verse, e.g., the popular Cūḍāmaṇi-nighaṇṭu (a work of the ninth century A.D.) or the older Piṅgala-nighaṇṭu. But none of these can help us to determine whether a particular word is Sanskrit or Tamil. They are at best a collection of synonyms under various heads classified according to subjects. The eleventh book of these nighaṇṭus is devoted to the description of words with different meanings. An ancestor of the present writer elaborated this division into a separate work and named it Nānārtha-dīpikai. This work has not yet, however, seen the light of day. But it may be mentioned that it is by far the most exhaustive work extant containing, as it does, a large number of Sanskrit words which the author corrupted himself so as to be useful for any future translation of Sanskrit works. Again, that was the first work in Tamil to contain a section corresponding to the Sanskrit Ēkākṣara-nighaṇṭu. As regards the scope of the nighaṇṭus, the other Dravidian languages do not seem to have fared better. Kanarese has the Karṇāṭaka-śabda-mañjarī by Tōṇṭadārya whose date, according to B. L. Rice, is A.D. 1480. It is said to be a vocabulary of tadbhava and Kannaḍa words in 120 ṣaṭpadī verses. An earlier work, the Maṅga-rāja-nighaṇṭu or Kavi-maṅgābhidhāna by Abhinava Maṅga Rāja (A.D. 1398—1433) is described by the same authority to be a valuable dictionary in Kannaḍa verse on the plan of the Amara-kōśa giving the Kannaḍa meanings of Sanskrit words commonly used in the language. The Telugu Āndhra-nāma-saṅgrahamu, and its supplement, the Āndhra-nāma-śēṣamu, like the Kanarese Karṇāṭaka-śabda-mañjari, are vocabularies of tadbhava and Telugu words. But no attempt has been made to distinguish tadbhavas from pure Telugu words. Modern commentaries, it must be mentioned, do give the original Sanskrit words in the case of tadbhavas. These are a little better than the Tamil nighaṇṭus, which do not exclude the tatsamas. And tatsama in Kanarese and Telugu means a good deal.

Coming to the regular dictionaries, the first for Tamil was the Caturakarāti written by Father Beschi (printed for the first time in 1819). That was, however, only a re-arrangement of the matter

contained in the nighaṇṭus so as to facilitate reference. It was a small work. Native writers improved upon it in course of time and put forth larger and larger dictionaries. The largest is considered to be the best by the ordinary people, and writers have been vying with one another to give a greater number of synonyms with the result that often in the case of Sanskrit words meanings unknown to Tamil literature are found bodily transferred from Sanskrit dictionaries. The most exhaustive dictionary yet published, the Tamiḻccolla-karāti of the Madura Tamil Sangham, is no better. Moreover it is inaccurate and unscientific. It derives Ta. *caṅkai*, 'measure' from S. *janghā-* (p. 987) while the original word would seem to be S. *saṅkhyā-*. Again, it connects Ta. *caṅku*, 'conch,' with S. *śaṅgu* (ibid.), which word I am not able to find in the Sanskrit dictionaries. The proper word would be *S. śaṅkha-*. No Sanskrit connexion is shown for *kalakam*, 'dispute' (p. 776), *kōḷam* 'a globe' (p. 972). The Sanskrit words are clearly *kalaha-* and *gōla-* respectively. The Tamil words *kaṭṭai*, 'fuel' (p. 718), *kammāḷar*, 'smiths' (p. 755), *ceṭṭi*, 'a Vaiśya' (p. 1150), *taṭṭam*, 'a fang' (p. 1204), are all given as pure Tamil words. They are surely Sanskrit words borrowed through Prakrit or Pali. Ta. *cuṇṇam*, 'powder' is given as a tadbhava of S. *cūrṇa-*. Right, but if Prakrit connexion were shown, it would be clearer. Ta. *cūtu* 'gambling' is guessed to be connected with S. *dyūta-*. A knowledge of Prakrit would make it certain. Māṇikkavācakar, in his Tiruvācakam, has used an expression *atentu* which has been puzzling many a paṇḍit. This authority makes it a Telugu expression (p. 134). Those who have a smattering of knowledge of Telugu will tell us that they cannot understand the expression. Some scholars regarded it as Kanarese. But the expression is Malayāḷam and means 'what is that?' From the context, of course, it may mean 'here I am' and so on.

There are, however, Tamil-English dictionaries by Rottler and Winslow. They are old, but it must be acknowledged they served their purpose well in their own days. Why, Winslow has not been superseded yet. It is hoped that the Tamil dictionary, by some called the New Tamil Dictionary, which name was perhaps suggested by the New English Dictionary, to be published by the University of Madras, will be a standard dictionary.

The Telugu-English Dictionary by C. P. Brown is on a par with Winslow's. Sītārāmacāryulu's Śabdaratnākaramu is a valuable dictionary of Telugu viewed from the standpoint of orthodox paṇḍits.

Dr. Gundert's Malayāḷam Dictionary is a really good dictionary for Malayāḷam and was written from a philologist's standpoint. It is full of philological matter and of suggestions for the student of the Dravidian languages. Dr. Gundert divides with Dr. Caldwell the honour of being the father of Dravidian philology.

Dr. Kittel's Kannaḍa Dictionary did for Kanarese what Dr. Gundert's did for Malayāḷam, and more. Appearing much later it is fuller and much more helpful to the student of Dravidian philology. Further it is more systematic. The New Tamil Dictionary to justify its appearance must have at least the merits of Dr. Kittel's work. An improvement on Dr. Kittel's system will be certainly welcome.

Thus it is a good dictionary that can enable us to distinguish pure Dravidian words from Sanskrit or other foreign words. Dr. Kittel's, for instance, differentiates the pure Dravidian words by printing them in bolder type. But no finality has yet been reached as regards the determination of the origins of words. Sanskrit words are the most puzzling. They are divided into tatsamas and tadbhavas as has been already pointed out. Tadbhavas are not easily discernible. A knowledge of the Prakritic languages and of Pali seems to be an essential for one who has to deal with Sanskritic tadbhavas in the Dravidian languages. For Sanskrit words have entered them not only directly but also through the Prakritic languages and Pali. Ignorance of these languages or at any rate of the phonetic laws that govern the importation of Sanskrit words in these has led, as in the case of the author of the Tamiḻccollakarāti, to mistaking tadbhavas for pure Dravidian words.

Another error that besets the workers in this department of philology is to regard as Sanskrit whatever word is found in the Sanskrit lexicons. Sanskrit, like other languages, has borrowed from time to time words from languages with which it came in contact. Dravidian languages have certainly been among such. The author of the Prayōga-vivēkam must have thought that he was doing a great service to Tamil when he conceded that *maṇalūr*, a dēśya word, was found in the Vyāsa-Bhārata. It needed a Dr. Gundert to proclaim to the world that Sanskrit was indebted in some measure to the Dravidian tongues so far as its vocabulary at least was concerned. For it was Dr. Gundert that contributed to the Journal of the German Oriental Society for 1869 an article on the Dravidian Elements in Sanskrit. Dr. Kittel contributed his on the Dravidian Element in Sanskrit Dictionaries to the Indian Antiquary for August 1872. Dr. Caldwell, in his Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages (second edition, 1875), has dwelt at some length on the same subject in part VII dealing with glossarial affinities (p. 452). He has fully utilized the materials contained in the articles above mentioned. One cannot, however, argue that Dr. Caldwell was inspired by Dr. Gundert or Dr. Kittel, for there is evidence in his work to prove that he has been himself thinking in the same groove. The labours of these orientalists enabled him to give a fuller treatment to the subject. More recently Dr. Kittel, in his Kannaḍa Dictionary (1894), made a list

of all the words he regarded as probably borrowed by Saṃskṛta from Draviḍa (Preface, p. XVII). They are 420 in number.

Much, however, remains yet to be done for Sanskrit itself in this field. Indo-Germanic words in Sanskrit in the first place must be differentiated from loan words, and the latter must be traced to their source as far as practicable. In Part II of August Fick's Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Germanic Languages (1890) the word-stock of Sanskrit and other Indo-Iranian languages is dealt with etymologically. Dr. C. C. Uhlenbeck has written an Etymological Dictionary of Sanskrit. There is, of course, the grand Petersburg Sanskrit Wörterbuch (1855—1875). All these are in foreign languages, and on that account sealed books to many an earnest Indian student of Dravidian languages. Besides such works become old soon and have to be revised from time to time so as to embody the results of researches made by scholars.

If Sanskrit has borrowed from the Dravidian languages, it has flooded them with its own words. The relation of Sanskrit to these languages is often compared to the relation of Latin to English. The dictionaries of the Dravidian languages are full, too full of Sanskrit words. In modern literary composition they have become a necessity. But times there were when Sanskrit words were rarely used. People can be found among educated men who will challenge us to show a single Sanskrit word in the Tolkāppiyam or the Tirukkuṟal or the Pattuppāṭṭu. Some time ago I heard a good Telugu scholar say that the Āndhra-nāma-saṅgrahamu contains only pure Dravidian words. Tadbhavas, I suppose, he did not regard as Sanskrit. No doubt the Dravidian languages have words wherewith to express simple ideas; Sanskrit words are, however, necessary to carry on any complex process of thought. They are false patriots who would underrate the importance of Sanskrit words for modern needs and plead for purism in vernacular literature.

Sanskrit words have not entered the Dravidian languages all of a sudden or by design. To trace the connexion of Sanskrit with the Dravidian languages one will have to go far back to the early centuries of the Christian era. Taking Tamil, for instance, one is led to think that Sanskrit influenced it even in the centuries that preceded the birth of Christ. The earliest Tamil work extant, the Tolkāppiyam, already referred to, contains several Sanskrit words. Omitting words whose origin may be regarded as doubtful, the following may be given: *teyvam* (S. *daiva-*), *kāraṇam*, *kālam*, *ulakam* (S. *lōka-*), *pūtam* (S. *bhūta-*), *varuṇaṉ* (S. *varuṇa-*), *paruvam* (S. *parvan-*), *tūtu* (S. *dūta-*), *nimittam*, *ēmam* (S. *kṣēma-*), *māṉam*, *uvamam* (S. *upamā-*), *kāmam*, *nāṭakam*, *mārāyam* (S. *mahārāja-*), *piṇṭam* (S. *piṇḍa-*), *araṇam* (S. *śaraṇa-*), *tēm* and *tēyam* (S. *dēśa-*), *maṅkalam* (S. *maṅgala-*), *tāṉai* (S. *sēnā-*), *aracar* (S. *rājan-*), *tāpatar* (S. *tāpasa-*), *avi* (S. *haviṣ-*), *pali* (S. *bali-*), *avaiyam* (S. *sabhā-*). *pakkam* (S. *pakṣa-*), *pēy* (S. *piśāca-*), *amarar* (S. *amara-*), *vaṉṉam*

(S. *varna-*), *niccam* (S. *nitya-*), *karumam* (S. *karman-*), *karaṇam*, *amutam* (S. *amṛta-*), *antaram*, *ētu* (S. *hētu-*), *vatuvai* (S. *vadhū-*), *kuṇam* (S. *guṇa-*), (*peru-*)*mitam*, *uru* (S. *rūpa-*), *cuṇṇam* (S. *cūrṇa-*), *māttirai* (S. *mātrā-*), *āyiram* (S. *sahasra-*), *cinnam* (S. *cihna-*), *cūttiram* (S. *sūtra-*), *paṭalam*, *mantiram* (S. *mantra-*), *kuñcaram* (S. *kuñjara-*), *manam* (S. *manas-*), *vaicikan* (S. *vaiśya-*), *utti* (S. *yukti-*), *atikāram* (S. *adhikāra-*), *āṇai* (S. *ājñā-*), *ñāpakam* (S. *jñāpaka-*). Some of these words, however, would go into Dr. Kittel's list already referred to, e.g., *kālam*, *nāṭakam*, *piṇṭam*, *pali*, *pakkam*, *pēy*, *uru*. The list of Sanskritic words in the Tolkāppiyam given herein, is well nigh exhaustive. Four of the words show distinctly Prakrit influence: *vaṇṇam*, *niccam*, *cuṇṇam* and *āṇai*.

The Tirukkuṟaḷ has a larger proportion of Sanskrit words. The very first distich contains *āti* (S. *ādi-*), *pakavaṉ* (S. *bhagavant-*), and *ulaku* (S. *lōka-*). The Pattuppāṭṭu does not contain such a proportion of Sanskrit words, true; but no one contends that it is an earlier work on that account. It is the subject-matter often that determines the proportion of the Sanskrit element in the diction of a Tamil work of this kind.

If we regard this period as the first when Sanskrit words were imported into Tamil, the next is the period of the Jain ascendancy when there was a large output of really good Tamil works. The Jains, however, when they introduced Sanskritic words in their works, introduced the Prakrit forms freely. The Maṇimēkalai, the Cintāmaṇi, the Cūḷāmaṇi afford us a number of examples of this type of words: *tammam* (S. *dharma-*), *accaṇandi* (S. *āryanandin-*), *vatam* (S. *vrata-*), *kappam* (S. *kalpa-*), *uyyānam* (S. *udyāna-*). The Jain scholars not only wrote original kāvyas in Tamil, they translated Sanskrit works; they wrote good grammars, of which the Naṉṉūl, that remains to this day the most popular, was written by Pavaṇanti (Bhavanandin) in the twelfth century A.D.; they commented on old Tamil works; they were perhaps the first to introduce the maṇipravāla style of writing in Tamil. Cīvakacarittiram, extracted from the Śrī-purāṇam in the second edition of the Tamil Jīvakacintāmaṇi, is an example of their activity in this direction. Possibly the Vaiṣṇava writers who commented on the Nālāyira Prabandhas were influenced largely by the Jain writers who must have either preceded them or been their contemporaries. The Śaiva literature has not many maṇipravāla works to boast of, the Śaiva Tirumuṟais (the sacred literature) have not been favoured with any exegesis similar to that for the Prabandhas. Sanskrit scholars, Śivāgra Yōgin and Jñāna Prakāśa wrote their commentaries on the Śivajñāna-siddhiyār, a Śaiva Śāstra, in a Sanskrit-ridden style that reads somewhat like maṇipravāla. During this period, then, of the maṇipravāla style, Sanskrit words were borrowed again directly from Sanskrit, because they were borrowed by Sanskrit scholars from Sanskrit literature. In the period when the

Tolkāppiyam was written, the Āryan Brāhmans had already come to South India and had even introduced their ceremonies and institutions. The Tolkāppiyam shows a medley of the Dravidian and the Āryan institutions. It shows distinct traces of the influence of the Āryan immigrants. During that period, therefore, the Āryans naturally introduced their vocabulary into the Tamil language. In the period of the Jain ascendancy, the Prakrit-speaking people must have come in contact with the Dravidians and given them the Prakrit forms of Sanskrit words. Early in this period, i.e., in the early centuries of the Christian era, Pali must have exerted considerable influence on the vocabulary of Tamil. Oldenberg, in his Buddha, thinks that Pali was once the popular language of Southern India (Uhlenbeck's Manual of Sanskrit Phonetics, Introduction, paragraph 5). The free intercourse between India and Ceylon in the early times must have indeed brought some Pali-knowing Buddhist priests to India and must have led in an appreciable measure to the enrichment of the Tamil vocabulary with Pali words. When Pali and Prakrit compete for consideration in tracing a Tamil tadbhava, it would be only fair to give the palm to Pali. Towards the close of the Jain period, however, the Tamil grammarians had systematised the borrowings from Sanskrit. The Naṉṉūl, for instance, gives rules that should regulate the formation of tadbhavas. They do not, however, apply to Pali or Prakritic words. The rules nevertheless were adopted, and in later times, when Sanskrit words were borrowed, they were corrupted according to these rules only. That takes us then to the third period. Still later, in recent times, the Tamil alphabet was improved to admit Sanskrit words being transliterated as far as practicable by the addition of *j, ṣ, s,* and *h,* Some have even added *ś.* All these were borrowed from the Grantha alphabet. These letters were borrowed to represent such words as *jayam*, *kaṣṭam*, *vastu*, and *hari*, the tadbhavas *ceyam*, *kaṭṭam*, *vattu*, and *ari* having become classical. Some scholars would not stop here. They would push this principle of transliteration to an absurd length. If they had adopted the Grantha alphabet in toto, one would not have anything to say against them. They would transliterate Sanskrit words in Tamil with the defective alphabet they have, e.g., they would write *krāmam* for S. *grāma-*, *isvaraṉ* for S. *iśvara-*, *kruṣi* for S. *kr̥ṣi-*, and sometimes would startle us with a hyper-Sanskritized false form like *palāṣṭikaṉ* for S. *balādhya-*. There is, however, no need for such transformations.

Whatever might be the period when particular Sanskrit words entered Dravidian literature, they are all either tatsamas or tadbhavas as has been already pointed out: and tatsamas, according to Tamil grammarians, are formed of letters common to both Sanskrit and Tamil, e.g., *vāri*, *mēru*. One would like to make their scope a little wider and include in them Sanskrit words which undergo change in Tamil just to suit its special grammatical

peculiarities as for instance *parai* for S. *parā-*. Malayāḷam regards *sabha* and *manassu* as tatsamas only, and Telugu regards such a word as *rāmuḍu* as a tatsama. Kanarese, too, follows the same principle. The tatsamas present little difficulty as a comparison of the vocabularies settles the matter at once. Only the question to which language a particular word belongs must remain open until we are able to make use of good Sanskrit and Tamil dictionaries paying special attention to the etymological side of these languages. The tadbhavas, however, present some difficulty. In the first place, the words should be identified with the Sanskrit originals, for often one finds sound-laws have been very active and corrupted words beyond easy recognition. Then the relation between the Dravidian form and the Sanskrit original should be established by an enunciation of the laws that have operated.

The aim of this paper is to take some tadbhavas more or less at random and to illustrate with them the sound-laws that have operated in the passage of words from Sanskrit to the Dravidian languages. It needs no apology that many terms have been taken from the spoken language. Philology is not concerned with literary dialects only. Again, more prominence will be found to have been given to tadbhavas in Tamil than in any other Dravidian language for the simple reason that the writer's acquaintance with those languages is not long enough to warrant him to speak of words in them with confidence. He has had to rely for the most part on the dictionaries in those languages, except in the case of Malayāḷam. His stay in Cochin and Travancore for a little time and his acquaintance, though short, with Malayāḷam literature has enabled him often to dispense with the use of the Malayāḷam dictionary. It is unnecessary to point out, perhaps, that the term tadbhava denotes, in this thesis, only the corrupted forms from Sanskrit. It is not used in that broad sense which the modern grammarians of Malayāḷam, for instance, give it.

SANSKRIT VOWELS.

Their treatment in Tamil and Malayāḷam Tadbhavas.

a > *i*.

S. *ācārya-*, 'a teacher'; Pa. *ācariya*; Ta. *āciriyaṉ*.

S. *pāṭala-*, 'name of a tree'; Ta. *pātiri*; Ma. *pātiri*; Ka. *pādari*; Te. *pādiri*.

S. *ācārya-* is *ācariya* in Pali (Andersen, p. 36). The Tamil tadbhava is surely from the Pali form. The change of *a* to *i* is noteworthy. It seems to be due to the long vowel of the first syllable, which is accented, and the influence of the anaptyctic vowel *i* between *r* and *y*. Ta. *āciriyam*, 'name of a metre,' may perhaps be connected with *āciriyaṉ*, denoting, as it does, an old metre held in considerable esteem. The same remark applies to Ta. *pātiri*. The Prakrit form is *pāḍala* (Kumārapālacarita, III, 31). The decerebralization is due to Dravidian influence. S. *pāṭala-* is probably not a Sanskrit word.

This vowel-change is noticeable among Dravidian languages themselves.

Ta. *kaṭā*, 'male of cattle'; Ma. *kiṭāvu*.

Ta. *kaṉā*, 'dream'; Ma. *kināvu*.

a > *e*.

S. *gati-*, 'motion'; Ta. *keti*.

S. *jaya-*, 'victory'; Ta. *ceyam*.

S. *bala-*, 'strength'; Ta. *pelam*.

S. *darśana-*, 'seeing'; Ta. *tericaṉam*.

S. *gandha-*, 'smell'; Ta. *kentam*; Ma. *kentuka*, 'to stink.'

S. *jagat-*, 'world'; Ta. *cekam*; Ma. *cekam*.

S. *daśaratha-*, 'name of a king'; Ma. *tēratan*.

This change from *a* to *e* is found in the case of words borrowed from Sanskrit, which begin with a non-aspirated voiced stop. Compare S. *ghaṭa-*, 'a pitcher', S. *bhakti-* 'devotion', S. *jhaṭiti*, 'quickly', and S. *dhana-* 'wealth' which become only Ta. *kaṭam*, Ta. *patti*, Ta. *caṭiti*, and Ta. *taṉam* respectively. S. *ghana-* 'hard' and S. *ghaṭikā-*, 'a measure of time equal to 24 minutes,' must have been borrowed and pronounced for a long time as words without aspiration. So we hear [gɛnəm] and [gɛḍija:rəm]. The old Tamil word *pēm* is perhaps a tadbhava of S. *bhaya-*, 'fear', pronounced without aspiration, which sometimes occurs as *beyam*. Or it is only a case of onomatopœia as *pē* or *bē* is just the sound produced by a person in dread. The same sound may be the origin also of Ta. *pēy*, 'a devil,' as a person in dread only is known to be able to see devils or phantoms. It is worth noting that when *b* changes into *v* as in *valam*, the *a* remains unchanged. Malayāḷam, however, can

show *velam*. Compare *palam*, a tadbhava of S. *phala-*, 'fruit.' In Tamil itself *kal*, 'stone or to dig,' is pronounced by some people [kellŭ]. Ta. *kaṭṭu*, 'a tie,' is also *keṭṭu* and in Malayāḷam is *keṭṭu*. Ta. *kalakku*, 'to stir up,' is in Telugu *kelaku*.

S. *campaka-*, 'name of a flower'; Ta. *ceṇpakam*; Ma. *cembakam*.

S. *carman-*, 'skin'; Ta. *cemmāṉ*, a shoemaker'; Ka. *samma*; Ma. *cemmān*.

S. *śayyā-*, 'a bed'; Te. *sejja*; Ka. *sejje*.

S. *śabda-*, 'sound'; Ma. *cettam*.

The tadbhavas of S. *śayyā-* are through the Prakrit *sejja* (Pischel, p. 86). The word *ceccai* in the Tamil 'Tirumalaināyakkaṉ ceccai' is perhaps only a Tamil form of the Prakrit *sejja*.

S. *arka-*, 'name of a plant'; Ta. *erukku*; Ma. *erikku*; K. *erke*. This is perhaps the only instance of an initial *a* changing into *e*. In Sanskrit words beginning with *y* followed by *a* is often observed this change, e.g., S. *yantra-*, 'a machine', Ta. *entiram*; S. *yama*, 'death', Ta. *emaṉ*. Is it possible that *a* was pronounced with a *y* added on to it before this change happened? The anaptyctic vowel *u* is just what one would expect to have after *r*. But Dr. Kittel regards this as a Dravidian word borrowed by Sanskrit (Kannada Dictionary, Preface, XXII). It may be noted in this connexion that the Tamils in certain provinces show a tendency to pronounce *e* as *a* in some words, e.g., *ellā* [allā], *embi* [ambi].

a > *ai*.

S. *masūri-*, 'small-pox'; Ta. *vacūri*, *vaicūri*.

S. *āśvayuja-*, 'belonging to the month Aśvina'; Ka. *āśvija*; Ta. *arpici-*, *appici*, *aippici*, *aippaci*.

The Tamil *arpici* is derived from Ka. *āśvija*. There is a tendency in Tamil to change *a* into *ai*. Taking Tamil words themselves we observe the change in the beginning of words in *maiyal* (*mayal*), 'delusion', *aintu* (*añcu*), 'five', *paiyal* (*payal*), 'boy'; compare Ma. *paital*. In the middle of words, in *araicu* (*aracu*), 'king'; *ilaiñci* (*ilañci*), 'fort-wall'; *paḻaimai* (*paḻamai*), 'oldness'; *iḷaimai* (*iḷamai*), 'youth.'

We observe this latter change in the following so-called Sanskritic words too:

S. *laya-*, 'dissolution'; Ta. *ilaiyam*.

S. *valaya-*, 'a bracelet'; Ta. *valaiyam*.

S. *malaya-*, 'name of a mountain'; Ta. *malaiyam*.

S. *kalaśa-* 'a pitcher.'; Ta. *kalaiyam*.

These forms, however, are not regarded as elegant. Although *malaiyam* is a tadbhava of S. *malaya-*, the Sanskrit word itself is derived from Ta. *malai*, 'a mountain.' S. *valaya-* again is derived from Ta. *vaḷai*, 'to surround,' the Dravidian root being *vaḷ*. S. *nilaya-* is a Sanskritized Tamil *nilai* from the Dravidian root *nil*.

Compare *maitta*, the colloquial form for Ta. *maṟṟa*, 'other,' and *paittu*, another colloquial word which stands for Ta. *paṟṟu* in the sense of payments.

ā > ai.

S. *ārya-*, 'worthy'; K. *ajja*; Ta. *aiyaṉ*.
The Tamil form must be derived through the Pali *ayya* (Andersen, p. 32). *ai* is only another mode of writing *ay*. The more recent tadbhava is *āriyaṉ*. The Kanarese form is through Prakrit *ajja* (Pischel, p. 195) and perhaps is the original of the Tamil-Malayāḷam *accaṉ*.

S. *amātya-*, 'a minister'; Ta. *amaiccaṉ*.
The Tamil tadbhava would be *amāttiyaṉ* according to the rules of Tamil grammar. Here again we see the Pali influence. The Pali form is *amacca* (Andersen, p. 31). As in words written above *ai* is written although only *a* is pronounced. Among Tamil words we find the diphthong in *uṭaimai* and *aṭaimāṉam* pronounced as simple *a*

i > a

S. *puṣkariṇi-*, 'a piece of water'; Ta. *puṭkaraṇi*.

S. *pṛthivī-*, 'the earth'; Ta. *puṭavi*; Te. *puḍami*.
The Tamil *puṭkaraṇi* must have been got by comparison with Pali *pokkharaṇi* (Andersen, p. 183). Prakrits have only *pokkhariṇi* (Pischel, p. 100). If, as Oldenberg thinks, Pali was once the popular language of Southern India, it is probable that Pali has influenced Tamil more than any of the Prakrits spoken in the north or communicated through books. A fact in favour of this is that the Tamil *puṭkaraṇi* is a popular word. And *puṭavi*, which is found in literature only, is no doubt derived through the Prakrit *puḍhavi* (Pischel, p. 50). In the absence of any evidence to prove that S. *rohiṇi*, 'name of a lunar mansion', is changed into Ta. *urōkaṇi* through the influence of Pali or Prakrit, one has to assume that the change is due to analogy of forms like the preceding.

S. *dīkṣita-*, 'a priest engaged in a dīkṣā'; Ta. *tīṭcataṉ*.
This form also must have come into use by analogy with such forms as *rāṭcataṉ*. It is remarkable that such changes occur only in words that are constantly used by the people.

i > e

S. *vināyaka-*, 'name of a god'; Te. *venakayya*.
The change of *i* to *e* in the first syllable is quite common in the Dravidian languages, e.g., *iṭai* (*eṭai*), *cila* (*cela*), *niṟai* (*neṟai*), *ciṟu* (*ceṟu*, also Malayāḷam) *piṟai* (Ka. *peṟe*). Tamil grammarians following Sanskrit grammarians hold that *e* and *o* are compound letters composed of *a*, *i* and *a*, *u* respectively. But that is against facts. *e* and *i*, *o* and *u* are related in this way: while *e* and *o* are open sounds, *i* and *u* are closed ones produced under similar conditions.

In the case of words mentioned here, the *i* is broadened into *e* under the influence of the broad vowel of the following syllable.

u > *i*

S. *manuṣya-*, 'man'; Ta. *maṉitaṉ, maṉucaṉ, maṉuṭaṉ.*

S. *āyuṣ(ya)-*, 'life, long life'; Ka. *āyisa*; Ta. *āyicu.*

In both these cases, the *u* seems to have dropped before *i* came in. Even now one hears these words pronounced as *mansan* and *āysu*. The Tamil *āytam*, the name of a Tamil letter, is considered to be a tadbhava of S. *āyudha-*, 'a weapon'. It should also be pointed out that the tadbhava *āyutam* is rarely pronounced as such. One hears rather *i* than *u* in the second syllable.

S. *anuja-*, 'a younger brother'; Ma. *aniyan.*

As in the case of the above words, one has to imagine an intermediate form *anjan.*

The Tamil *purai*, 'a roofed building' is colloquially *pirai* as in Ta. *kuttuppirai*, and is *pirai* in Malayāḷam as well. Ta. *muṉ*, 'before, anterior', is *miṉ* colloquially and in Malayāḷam *min* as in *minñānnu*, 'the day before yesterday'; compare also Ta. *munti* > *minti.*

u > *o*

S. *uṣṭra-*, 'a camel'; Ta. *oṭṭai*; Ma. *oṭṭe*; Te. *oṇṭe*; Ka. *oṭṭe, oṇṭe.*

u in the first syllable has a tendency to become *o* in the Dravidian languages. This was noticed when *i* > *e* was considered. Many words in Tamil with *u* in the first syllable are pronounced as if they had *o*, e.g., *kuḷam*, 'a tank'; *tuṭai*, 'the thigh'; *nurai*, 'foam'; *puṭai*, 'a hole'. Some regard *oṭṭai* as a Dravidian word, and in support of this view take *oṭṭakam*, also in use for *oṭṭai*, and derive it from two Tamil words *oṭṭu* and *akam*. This is a very improbable derivation as the word is found in Persian and some other languages too. And the word *oṭṭakam* itself is very likely a corruption of *oṭṭakai*, a tadbhava of S. *uṣṭrikā-*. *oṇṭe* in Kanarese and Telugu is a nasalized form of *oṭṭe*. Compare Hindustani *ūṇṭ.*

S. *kuṭhāra-*, 'an axe'; Ka. *koḍali, koḍli*; Ta. *kōṭāli, kōṭari.*

The Tamil *kōṭari* again is popularly derived from two simple words *kōṭu*, 'branch' and *ari*, 'chop off'.

S. *tuṇḍa-*, 'mouth, beak'; Te. *toṇḍamu*; Ta. *toṇṭai.*

S. *guṇa-*, 'a quality'; Te. *goṇamu.*

S. *bhujaṅga-*, 'a serpent'; Ka. *bojaṅga.*

Ta. *pustakam* is colloquially pronounced *postakam*. Again Ta. *ural* is Ka. *oralu* and Ta. *ulakkai* is Ka. *onake.*

ē > *a*

S. *rēvati-*, 'name of a lunar mansion'; Ma. *iravati.*

The change seems to be due to the prothetic vowel in the tadbhava, which is accented.

r > *i*, *iru* (*ir*^{u})

S. *ṛṣabha*-, 'a bull'; Ta. *iṭapam*; Ma. *iṭapam*, *iṭavam*.
S. *hṛdaya*-, 'the heart'; Ta. *itayam*; Ka. *hidayu*, *hedaya*.
S. *vṛṣan*-, 'a bull'; Ta. *viṭai*.
S. *ṛṣi*-, 'a sage'; Ta. *iruṭi*; Ma. *iriṣi*.
S. *vṛkṣa*-, 'a tree'; Ta. *virukkam*.
S. *tṛṇa*-, 'grass'; Ta. *tiruṇam*.
S. *gṛha*-, 'a house'; Ta. *kirukam*; Ma. *kiriyam*.

The Pali form of *ṛṣi* is *isi* (Andersen, p. 46). Tamil perhaps avoided that kind of change lest it should yield *iḍi* which is already a Tamil word meaning thunder. We have in Tamil more recent tadbhavas *riṣapam*, *irutayam*, *riṣi* as well as *ruṣi*, *viruṭcam*. These indicate that the pronunciation of *ṛ* was not correctly understood, and the change is the result of an attempt on the part of the Dravidians to represent a sound which was not familiar to them. Again, that the prothetic vowel before *r* is *i* is evident from the tadbhavas. The Tamil words indicate only the change of *ṛ* into *i* and *ir*^{u}. Pali shows *a* as in S. *prākṛta*-, *pākata* (Andersen, p. 173) which the Dravidian tongues have adopted. Other examples are *hadaya* (*hṛdaya*-, 'the heart'—Andersen, p. 280), *pathavi*, (*pṛthivi*-, 'the earth'—Andersen, p. 158). Tamil has also variant forms for *tṛṇa*- and *gṛha*-, to wit *tiraṇam* and *giraham*. These are considered to be wrong, but their existence cannot be denied. And *giraham* is apt to be confounded with the tadbhava of S. *graha*-, a Sanskrit word meaning planet. The Malayāḷam tadbhavas *iriṣi* and *kiriyam* show the change *ir*^{i} for *ir*^{u} of Tamil.

S. *kṛṣṇa*-, 'an incarnation of Viṣṇu'; Ta. *kaṇṇaṉ*; Ma. *kaṇṇan*. The Prakrit form is *kaṇha* (Pischel, p. 51), and the Tamil-Malayāḷam form seems to be derived through it. There are more recent tadbhavas *kiruṣṭṇaṉ*, *kiṭṭaṉ* which are also current in somewhat changed form in Kanarese and Telugu.

S. *vṛtta*-, 'a circle'; Ta. *vaṭṭam*.
S. *nṛtta*- or *nāṭya*-, 'dance'; Ta. *naṭṭam*.

The Tamil *vaṭṭam* is surely derived from the Pali form (Andersen, p. 226). It is also found in Prakrit (Pischel, p. 49). The more recent tadbhava is *viruttam*. The author of the Prayōga-vivēkam while regarding *vaṭṭam* as a tadbhava, is not inclined to derive it through Prakrit. *āṇai*, *naṭṭam*, *viṇṇāṇam* he puts under the same category. But Naccinārkkiṉiyar and a still earlier commentator Cēnāvaraiyar have taken *āṇai*, *vaṭṭam*, *naṭṭam*, and *kaṇṇaṉ* to be Prakrit forms borrowed by Tamil. (Tolkāppiyam, Collatikāram, Naccinārkkiṉiyam, p. 234; Cēnāvaraiyam, p. 212.)

Again, Pali has *nacca* from S. *nṛtya*- (Andersen, p. 132). Dr. Gundert derives Ma. *naṭṭuvan* from S. *naṭya*-, perhaps a misprint for *nāṭya*- from which the Prakrit form *naṭṭa* can be derived: *naṭṭuvaṉ* is also a Tamil word and it must have come from *naṭṭam* with the termination changed as *naṭṭu*, and the masculine affix *aṉ*

added on. Similarly we have *vaṭṭu* from *vaṭṭam*. Both these words are often derived also from the Dravidian root *vaḷ*, which seems improbable.

S. *pṛthu-*, 'numerous'; Ta. *potu*; Ma. *potu*.

This *potu* looks like a pure Tamil word, but it cannot be connected with any Tamil root. It is likely that the Pali *puthu* (Andersen, p. 180), has given this form to Tamil. *Puthujjana* in Pali is used exactly in the sense in which *potujanam* is used in Tamil, 'the masses, vulgar people.' We have in colloquial Tamil *putu* also in the sense of common as in *putuniṟam*, 'complexion that can be said to be neither fair nor dark.' The ordinary meaning the word *putu* is 'new.'

S. *prakṛti-*, 'material cause'; Ta. *pakuti*.

S. *vikṛti-* 'change'; Ta. *vikuti*, 'suffix.'

These are distinctly Tamil forms. Pali has *pakati* (Andersen, p. 146). But we have in Tamil *pakaṭi*, *vikaṭi* which show Prakrit influence.

S. *sadṛśa-*, 'like'; Ta. *cari*; Te. *sari*; Ma. *śari*, *sari*; Ka. *sari*. *sari* is an old Tamil word but nevertheless it cannot be derived from any indigenous root. The form *sarisa* for *sadṛśa* is found in all Prakrit dialects (Pischel, p. 172). So it must have come to the Dravidian languages through Prakrit only. Dr. Gundert derives it from *cariyu* and *cār*: 'to be near.' But he did so evidently at a time when the influence of Prakrits on Dravidian languages was not so well realized.

S. *amṛta-*, 'ambrosia, nectar'; Ta. *amutam*, *amiḻtam*; Ka. *amardu*, *avardu*.

S. *amṛta-* first becomes *amirtam* and the *r* then changes into cerebral *r* (i.e., ழ). The form *amutam* is analogous to *pakuti* for *prakṛti-*. *amutam* is found in the Tolkāppiyam and *amiḻtam* in the Kuraḷ.

ai > *a*.

S. *paiśāca-*, 'a kind of demon'; Ta. *pacācam*.

The Tamils do not appear to treat *ai* as very different from *a*. Compare *maiyal*--*mayal*; *ilaiñci*—*ilañci*; *vacūri*—*vaicūri*; *vacciram*—*vaicciram*. The alternate forms like *ākācam* and *ākāyām* lead us to assume *paiyācam*, and then the change becomes quite intelligible. The influence of *y* in many of these cases is to be noted.

ai > *ayi*.

S. *kailāsa-*, 'name of a mountain'; Ta. *kayilācam*.

S. *vaira-*, 'enmity'; Ta. *vayiram*.

The diphthongal *ai* must have been pronounced as *a* and *i* separately before this change took place. Pr. *kaïlāsa* (Pischel, p. 56) and Pr. *vaïra* (Pischel, p. 56) show this stage in pronunciation. Then the *y* glide naturally comes in. Similarly the *v* glide with regard to *au* which will be noticed later.

ai > *e* or *ė*

S. *saindhava-*, 'a horse'; Ka. *sendava*.

S. *tailikat-*, 'an oilman'; Ka. *telliga*.

S. *vaiśākha-*, 'name of the second lunar month'; Ka. *bēsage*.

In these cases the change is just what happens in Prakrit. Pischel gives *tella* from S. *taila* (p. 56).

ai > *ey*.

S. *daiva-*, 'fate'; Ta. *teyvam*; Ma. *teyyam*; Te. *dayyamu*, 'a devil'; K. *devva*; Pr. *devva* (Pischel, p. 56).

ai although historically long was pronounced short even in olden times. It had become short even in the time of Pāṇini as is shown by the word *mairēya* from Prakrit *maira* from S. *madira-*. The *a* is short *a* and the peculiarity about it is that it is pronounced as *e*.

This peculiarity is observed also in pure Dravidian words. Compare *kai* and *key*, *mai* and *mey*.

ō > *ū*.

S. *kaṭhōra*, 'hard'; Ta. *kaṭūram*; Ka. *kaṭuram*.

This form seems to be due to analogy of such words as *kaṭu*, *kaṭumai*.

au > *ū*.

S. *sārvabhauma-*, 'an emperor'; Ta. *cāruvapūmaṉ*.

S. *āśauca-*, 'impurity'; Ta. *ācūcam*.

Here the change seems to be due to the recollection of the original words *bhūmi* and *śuci* while these are pronounced. *aśuci* suggests *ācucam*, *ācūcam*. Sometimes it is also *acūcam*.

au > *o*, *ō*.

S. *krauñca-*, 'name of a bird'; Te. *koñca*, *kroñca*; Ka. *koñce*.

S. *kaupina-*, 'a piece of cloth to cover nakedness'; Ta. *kōvaṇam*; Ka. *kōvaṇam*.

S. *kauśika-*, 'name of a sage'; Ta. *kōcikaṉ*; Pr. *kōsika* (Pischel, p. 57).

S. *gautama-*, 'name of a sage'; Ta. *kōtamaṉ*.

S. *mauli-*, 'a crown'; Ta. *mōli*; Pr. *mōli* (Pischel, p. 58).

S. *kauśala-* 'name of a province'; Ta. *kōcalam*.

This is decidedly a change peculiar to Prakrit and Pali. Tamil ordinarily inserts a *v* between *a* and *u*, which is known as 'the connecting *v*' or rather the *v*- glide, as in *kiravuñcam*, *kavupinam*, etc. Compare Pr. *kaüsala* (Pischel, p. 58) which is similar to Ta. *kavucalam*, and Pr. *maüna* from S. *mauna-*, 'silence' (Pischel, p. 58) which is similar to Ta. *mavunam*.

SANSKRIT DENTAL STOPS.

Their treatment in Tamil and Malayāḷam Tadbhavas.

Sanskrit dental stops are *t*, *th*, *d*, and *dh*. Tamil has only the letter *t* to represent all these sounds. But this letter has different sound-values determined by its position in words. Taking for instance the *t* combined with vowels, initially it is a voiceless stop like the Sanskrit *t*. Whatever may be the Sanskrit sound, it becomes only *t* at the beginning of a Tamil tadbhava. Medially, it has two values (i) that of the Sanskrit *d*, after the dental nasal, (ii) that of *th* in English *then* (the voiced interdental spirant ð). And whatever may be the Sanskrit sound, it is either of these only according as it is preceded by the dental nasal or not preceded by it.

Malayāḷam, however, has adopted the Sanskrit alphabet and can represent all the Sanskrit sounds by different letters. But it is remarkable that it follows Tamil sometimes in respect of the representation of these sounds. This bears testimony to the close relationship between Tamil and Malayāḷam, and indicates that the tendency to Sanskritize Malayāḷam is quite modern. As Dr. Gundert points out in his Malayāḷam Dictionary, *th*, *d* and *dh* occur only in Sanskrit and foreign words. But even in the case of Sanskrit words, these letters are not employed unless they are recent borrowings. And the sound-values of the medial *t* are just as they are in Tamil. Dr. Gundert, however, represents both by the Greek δ, e.g., S. *atula-*: *aδulam*, 'unequalled'; S. *antara-*: *anδaram*, 'interior.'

S. *takṣan-*, 'a carpenter'; Ta. *taccaṉ*; Ma. *taccan*.
S. *dāna-*, 'a gift'; Ta. *tānam*; Ma. *tānam*, 'penance'.
S. *dhūli-*, 'dust'; Ta. *tūḷi*; Ma. *tūḷi*.
S. *anta-*, 'end'; Ta. *antam*; Ma. *antam*.
S. *sindhu-*, 'name of a river'; Ta. *intu*; Ma. *intu*.
S. *patākā-*, 'a flag'; Ta. *patākai*; Ma. *patāka*.
S. *pada-*, 'step'; Ta. *patam*; Ma. *patam*.

The Tamil *antam*, *intu*, *patākai*, and *patam* are transliterated without any reference to the special sound-value of the medial *t*. If a new system can be adopted, *t* medial between vowels should be represented by ð, and *t* after the nasal by *d*. Dr. Gundert transcribes the Malayāḷam tadbhavas as *anδam*, *inδu*, *paδāya* and *paδam*.

When *t* is doubled, it has its normal sound; *dd*, and *ddh* also are equivalent to *tt* in Tamil, although some who know may pronounce them as *dd* or *ddh*.

S. *pitta-*, 'bile'; Ta. *pittam*; Ma. *pittam*.
S. *uddēśa-*, 'intention'; Ta. *uttēcam*; Ma. *uddēśam*.

S. *vr̥ddhi-*, 'prosperity'; Ta. *virutti*; Ma. *vr̥ddhi.*

Sometimes one hears such mispronunciations as *viddyāsam*; this is supposed to represent *vittiyācam*, a tadbhava of S. *vyatyāsa-*. Forms like *vittai*, a tadbhava of S. *vidyā-*, correctly pronounced *viddai*, might have affected the pronunciation of T. *vittiyācam.*

When *t* and *d* occur in combination with other consonants, i.e., when they form the initial letters of the conjunct consonants, they change in Tamil in all cases, while in Malayāḷam, *t* or *d* followed by *n*, *y*, *r*, *v*, do not change. In Tamil the dental is doubled as *tt* and an anaptyctic vowel appears after the double consonant.

S. *patnī-*, 'a wife'; Ta. *pattini*; Ma. *patni.*

S. *satya-*, 'truth'; Ta. *cattiyam*; Ma. *satyam.*

S. *udyōga-*, 'effort'; Ta. *uttiyōkam*; Ma. *udyōgam.*

S. *sattra-*, 'asylum'; Ta. *cattiram*, 'choultry'; Ma. *satram.*

S. *kṣudra-*, 'mean'; Ta. *kuttiram*, 'cheating'; Ma. *kṣudram.*

S. *sattva-*, 'strength'; Ta. *cattuvam*; Ma. *satvam.*

S. *udvēga-*, 'fear, sorrow'; Ta. *uttuvēkam*; Ma. *udvēgam*, 'care.'

t in combination with *k*, and *d* in combination with *g* change in Malayāḷam tadbhavas into *l*.

S. *utkarṣa-*, 'excellence'; Ma. *ulkarṣam.*

S. *sadguṇa-*, 'virtue'; Ma. *salguṇa.*

In Malayāḷam there is no separate letter to represent the consonantal *l*. The symbol ൽ is made to represent the consonantal *l* as well as the consonantal *t*. *ta* = ത; *la* = ല.

The same words would, in Tamil, become

S. *utkarṣa-*; Ta. *ur̲karṣam.*

S. *sadguṇa-*; Ta. *sar̲kuṇam.*

t in combination with *p*, and *d* in combination with *b* or *bh* also change in Malayāḷam tadbhavas into *l*.

S. *tātparya-*, 'object'; Ma. *tālparyam.*

S. *budbuda-*, 'a bubble'; Ma. *bulbudam.*

S. *adbhuta-*, 'surprise'; Ma. *albhutam.*

Sanskrit *tatpara-*, 'occupied with' becomes in Malayāḷam *tapparam* as well as *talparam*. The former form, of course, shows Prakritic influence.

The same words would, in Tamil, become

S. *tātparya-*; Ta. *tār̲pariyam.*

S. *budbuda-*; Ta. *pur̲putam.*

S. *adbhuta-*; Ta. *ar̲putam.*

t or *d* in combination with *m* change into *l*.

S. *ātman-*, 'the soul'; Ma. *ālmāvu.*

S. *padma-*, 'a lotus'; Ma. *palmam* (written *patmam*).

Orientalists like Dr. Gundert prefer to transcribe these in English as *āltmā* and *paltma*. No doubt some sound like *t* is often heard between *l* and *m*, but that is not defined, and far from being an equivalent of the dental voiceless stop in Malayāḷam, it approaches the English *t*. Compare also the pronunciation of *t* in

S. *ratna-* by Malayāḷis. The presence of *t* can be explained by the circumstance that people as they pronounce the *t* get the *l* but at once think of the *t*, and in attempting to bring it up again pronounce a slight *t* after *l* by way of compromise. In the case of *k*, *p*, *s*, etc., the slight *t* is assimilated by these consonants, and hence perhaps has been ignored by the orientalists. A more satisfactory explanation would appear to be a reference to the change the same sound undergoes in Tamil, viz., into the alveolar *r* [*ṟ*].

The same words would, in Tamil, become

S. *ātman-* ; Ta. *āṉmā*.

S. *padma-* ; Ta. *patumam*.

In *āṉmā*, the *n* is alveolar; the dental *n* is found only before a dental *t* or a dental *n*, and before consonants like *m* in tatsamas. In *patumam*, the *u* is anaptyctic.

But, besides *āṉmā*, there is *āttumā* and sometimes *āṟṟumā*. In compounds like S. *ātmanēpada-*, we observe the change '*āṟpanēppatam*.' This is noticeable again in the tadbhavas of S. *padma-*. We have *paṟpam*, *paṟmam* (a hypothetical form) which latter is difficult to pronounce. The change may be indicated thus :

S. *ātmanē* > *āṟmane* > *āṟpanē*.

S. *padmam* > *paṟmam* > *paṟpam*.

Compare Prakrit *appā* (Pischel, p. 82) from S. *ātman-*. From S. *bhasman-* also Tamil has a tadbhava *paṟpam*.

Again, *t* in combination with *s* changes in Malayāḷam tadbhavas into *l*.

S. *utsāha-*, 'energy'; Ma. *ulsāham*.

S. *matsya-*, 'a fish'; Ma. *malsyam*, also *maccam* ; Pr. *maccam*.

S. *vātsalya-*, 'affection'; Ma. *vālsalyam*.

The same words would, in Tamil, become

S. *utsāha-* ; Ta. *uṟcākam*, *uccākam*.

S. *matsya-* ; Ta. *maṟcam*, *maccam* ; Te. *maccemu*.

S. *vātsalya-* ; Ta. *vāṟcalliyam*, *vāccalliyam*.

The forms *uccākam*, *maccam*, and *vāccalliyam* show Prakritic influence. (*uccāha*—Pischel, p. 225 ; *maccha*—Pischel, p. 228.)

When *t* or *d* is final, it changes into *l* in Malayāḷam. The *t* is, however, retained when it is followed by another *t* in composition. Final *dh* also becomes *l*.

S. *īṣat*, 'a little'; Ma. *iṣal*.

S. *pariṣad-*, 'an assembly'; Ma. *pariṣal*, *pariṣa*.

S. *samidh-*, 'sacrificial sticks'; Ma. *samil*, *camata*.

The *t* is retained in sentences like *samittinnu vēṇṭi kāṭṭil pōyi*. *camata* and *pariṣa* are tadbhavas. The Ma. *upaniṣattu* from S. *upaniṣad-* shows influence of Tamil.

The same words would, in Tamil, become

S. *īṣat-* ; Ta. *iṣattu*.

S. *pariṣad-* ; Ta. *pariṣattu*.

S. *samidh-* ; Ta. *camittu*.

Now *t* and *d*, when they change, in Malayāḷam, change into *l*, and in Tamil usually into *ṟ* and occasionally into *ṉ*, which is the nasal of *ṟ*.

The change in Malayāḷam differs from the change in Tamil only in appearance. For in reality it is the same change and Malayāḷam shows only an intermediate stage in the passage of *t* or *d* into *r*.

If we analyse the Tamil words *saṟkuṇam* and *taṟparam*, for example, we find they are

sal + *kuṇam*.
tal + *param*.

and *l* becomes *ṟ* according to the rules of Tamil grammar:

kal + *ka* = *kaṟka*.
nūl + *ka* = *nūṟka*.

The vulgar pronounce *kalkka* and *nūlkka* with the consonant *k* doubled as it is in Malayāḷam. *ṟ* obviates the need for a second *k*.

Compare also

S. *kalpa-*, 'end of the world'; Ta. *kaṟpam*.
S. *valkala-*, 'bark-garment'; Ta. *vaṟkalai*.

Again, in compounds also, the same change is noticed:

Ta. *pāṟkaṭal*, 'sea of milk'; Ma. *pālkkaṭal*.
Ta. *ēṟpāṭu*, 'arrangement'; Ma. *ēlpāṭu*.

It is noteworthy that Malayāḷam does not double the consonant *p* after *l* except in *malppiṭi*, as it does in the case of *k*. Dr. Gundert transliterates this word with a single *p* only. And the doubling in these cases seems to be to represent the voiceless sound, rather than the double sound. Compare *pālkkaṭal* with *akkaṭal*.

The *m* changes the preceding *l* into *ṉ* in Tamil, e.g.—

Ta. *naṉmai* *nal* + *mai*, 'good.'
Ta. *mēṉmel* *mēl* + *mēl*, 'more and more.'
S. *śālmali-*, 'the silk-cotton tree'; Ta. *cāṉmali*.
S. *gulma-*, 'chronic stomach-ache'; Ta. *kuṉmam*.

In some other cases, too, *l* changes into *ṉ*, e.g.—

Ta. *nāṉku* (*nāl* + *ku*), 'four'.
Ta. *naṉku* (*nal* + *ku*), 'well'.

The form *nālku* is actually found in the Porunarāṟṟuppaṭai (l. 165) and in the Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaṭai (l. 489); and the alternative form for *naṉku*, *naṟku*, found in the Malaipaṭukaṭām (l. 392), is perhaps the regular form.

In Malayāḷam we find *l* takes the place of the Tamil *ṉ* in certain words, e.g., *mul* is often found for Ta. *muṉ*.

Ma. *mulkkaram* 'the forearm'; Ta. *muṟkaram*, *muṉ-karam*.
Ma. *mulkkālam* 'ancient times'; Ta. *muṟkālam*, *muṉ-kālam*.

Possibly *ṟ*, *ṉ* and *l* (found in these words) belong to the same class. They must all be alveolar. As there is no separate symbol in the Tamil alphabet to represent the alveolar *l* as distinguished

from the dental or cerebral *l*, one will have to be content with merely pointing out this peculiarity.

It has been found that, in Tamil, *l* interchanges with *ṟ* or *ṉ*. It depends on the succeeding letter. As a rule *l* changes into *ṟ* before voiceless stops.

The change of *l* into *ṉ* is found also in Malayāḷam. In compounds we are told *vaṉ* = *val* (Gundert's Dictionary, p. 906), e.g.—

vaṉkōpam, 'wrath.'
vaṉkāṟṟu, 'strong wind.'

The Malayāḷam alphabet in vogue at present does not make any difference between the dental *n* and the alveolar *n*. In pronunciation, however, such a difference *is* made as, for example, in words like *onnu* and *nannu* which correspond to Ta. *oṉṟu*, *naṉṟu*. *l*, too, is distinctly alveolar when it is found doubled in words, *e.g.* – *illa*, *nalla*.

In Madras, Ta. *poṉṉaṉ* is pronounced with a distinct medial alveolar *ṉ*. Compare also *uṉṉai*, *aṉpu*. That *ṟ* is alveolar can be seen from the pronunciation of Ta. *maṟṟa* which is almost *maiṟṟa*, and that accounts for the colloquial form *maitta*. Similarly *paittu* from *paṟṟu*. Subtle observation will reveal the alveolar nature of *l* in words like *ellā* and *nalla* as they are pronounced in Madras.

Such expressions as Ma. *vaṉkōpam* are employed in Tamil too, but often the following velar influences the alveolar *ṉ* and converts it into its own nasal, *e.g.*, *vaṉkiḻaṭu* is pronounced as *vaṅkiḻaṭu*.

The change in Tamil of *ṟ* into *r* + a consonant similar to the one succeeding is sometimes noticeable:

S. *tātparya-*, 'object'; Ta. *tārppariyam* for Ta. *tāṟpariyam*.
S. *udbhava-*, 'birth'; Ta. *urppavam* ,, Ta. *uṟpavam*.
S. *utsava-*, 'festival'; Ta. *urccavam* ,, Ta. *uṟcavam*.

That is, however, wrong spelling and misleads one in respect of the derivation of words.

The reverse of this is sometimes noticed:

S. *durguṇa-*, 'vice'; Ta *tuṟkuṇam* for Ta. *turkkuṇam*.
S. *arcanā-*, 'worship'; Ta. *aṟcanai* ,, Ta. *arccanai*.
S. *karpūra-*, 'camphor'; Ta. *kaṟpūram* ,, Ta. *karppūram*.

In these and similar cases, there is nothing to justify the introduction of the alveolar *ṟ*. The Sanskrit words transliterated in Tamil would become

turkuṇa
arcanā
karpūra

But *k*, *c*, *p* are not voiceless stops medially. Although in the case of the first word a soft sound only is required, there is a feeling in the Tamil mind that in all these cases the proper enunciation is not obtained unless the consonant is doubled. Thus to

insert the alveolar *ṟ* and keep the consonant single is an orthographical expedient.

Again, in Tamil, in the vulgar dialect, there is practically no difference between *t* and *ṟ* when these are doubled :

Ta. *paṟṟu*, 'hold'	>	*pattu*
Ta. *kāṟṟu*, 'air'	>	*kāttu*
Ta. *iṟṟu*, 'decaying'	>	*ittu*
Ta. *kiṟṟu*, 'a line'	>	*kittu*
Ta. *cuṟṟu*, 'go round'	>	*cuttu*
Ta. *ūṟṟu*, 'a spring'	>	*ūttu*
Ta. *neṟṟu*, 'dried fruit, specially of the coconut palm'	>	*nettu*
Ta. *nēṟṟu*, 'yesterday'	>	*nēttu*
Ta. *oṟṟu*, 'a consonant'	>	*ottu*
Ta. *pōṟṟu*, 'take care of'	>	*pōttu*

The above examples indicate the change of *ṟṟ* to *tt*. *tt* does not become *rr*. The people are prone to choose always the easiest way of pronouncing a word, and do it regardless of any other considerations. It is certainly easier to pronounce the dental *t* than the alveolar *r*. Take again the peculiar Tamil *ḻ*. By very few people is it pronounced properly. In the so-called Shen-Tamil districts, Tinnevelly and Madura, they do not make any difference in speech between *ḷ* and *ḻ*, although particular attention is paid to it in literary writing. When they are in doubt, they ask if it is *uḷāṇā* or *aḻāṇā*, in other words if it is the *ḷ* that occurs in the Tamil word *uḷa* or the *ḻ* that occurs in the Tamil word *aḻa*. In northern districts and about Madras, they make it equivalent to *y*. Thus *kiḻavi*, 'an old woman', becomes *kiyavi* first, and then *kēvi* ; *paḻam*, 'fruit', is invariably *payam*.

Some Sanskrit words have entered Tamil and Malayāḷam through Prakrit.

S. *airāvata-*, 'Indra's elephant'; Ta. *airāvaṇam* ; Pr. *airāvaṇa* (Pischel, p. 55).

S. *pratimā-*, 'an image'; Ta. *paṭimai* ; Pr. *paḍimā* (Pischel, p. 156).

S. *prakṛti-*, 'nature'; Ta. *pakaṭi, pakiṭi* ; Ma. *pakiṭi* ; Pr. *pagaḍi* (Pischel, p. 158).

S. *dambha-*, 'ostentation'; Ta. (*i*)*tampam* ; Ma. *ḍambham* ; Pr. *ḍambha* (Pischel, p. 160).

S. *pattana-*, 'a town,' also *paṭṭana-* ; Ta. *paṭṭaṇam* ; Ma. *paṭṭaṇam* ; Pr. *paṭṭaṇa* (Pischel, p. 227).

S. *vṛtta-*, 'a circle'; Ta. *vaṭṭam* ; Ma. *vaṭṭam* ; Pr. *vaṭṭa* (Pischel, p. 227).

S. *praticchanda-*, 'likeness'; Ta. *paṭiccantam*.

S. *kadamba-*, 'a tree'; Ta. *kaṭampu* ; Ma. *kaṭampu*.

The normal tadbhavas according to the rules of Tamil grammar would be *airāvatam*, *piratimai*, *pirakiruti*, *tampam*, *pattanam*, *viruttam*, *piraticcantam*, *katampam*, and in fact all these forms are found in Tamil and they should be regarded as doublets, forms directly borrowed from Sanskrit in later times. Ta. *paṭimai* is found in the Kampa Rāmāyaṇam; Ta. *pakaṭi* is popularly almost a synonym of S. *vikaṭa-* which is doubtless a Prakrit form from S. *vikṛta-* (Pischel, p. 157) and both are used in the sense of mockery, jest, etc. It is a curious transformation of meaning and ought to be of interest to a student of Semantics. But *pakaṭi* as an approved tadbhava of S. *prakṛti-* is found in a Jaina work, the Tirunūṟṟantāti, wherein it is, according to the commentator, employed in the sense of *karma*, 'action.' *Paṭiccantam* is found in the Tirukkōvaiyār. It is doubtful, however, if S. *paṭṭana-* is not a Dravidian word borrowed by Sanskrit, as words like Ta. *paṭṭi* would indicate. There is also a Tamil word *paṭṭiṇam* employed, in older works, in the sense of a sea-side village or town. *kadamba-* is a puzzling word. One is not able to find the tadbhava *kaṭampa* either in Prakrit or in Pali. Perhaps analogy accounts for it. There is in Sanskrit itself a variant *kalamba-* which, if it was pronounced with a cerebral *ḷ* instead of the dental as is often done (for instance, *mangaḷam*), could account for *ḍ* (in Tamil of course *ṭ*), which change cannot b[e] abnormal.

SANSKRIT SIBILANTS.

Their treatment in Tamil and Malayāḷam Tadbhavas.

The Palatal Sibilant.

The palatal *ś* is not altogether foreign to modern Tamil, although there is no distinct symbol to represent the sound even in the enlarged alphabet that is in use in school-books as well as in popular literature. The enlarged alphabet contains *j, ṣ, s, h*, and the compound letter *kṣ* too. *ś* is represented by the Tamil letter *c* which is pronounced *ś* except when it is doubled, in which case it has its normal value, the value that it has in Sanskrit of the palatal affricate. It must be admitted that in recent times some editors have found it desirable to adopt the Grantha *ś* (ஶ) in printing maṇipravāla literature.

The Malayāḷam alphabet, however, is not defective in this respect.

S. *śara-*, 'an arrow'; Ta. *caram*; Ma. *caram*.

S. *śāṇa-*, 'a whetstone'; Ta. *cāṇai*; Ma. *cāṇa*.

S. *śilā-*, 'stone'; Ta. *cilai*; Ma. *cila*.

S. *śūla-*, 'colic'; Ta. *cūlai*; Ma. *cūla*.

S. *śava-*, 'a corpse'; Ta. *cavam*; Ma. *cavam*; Pa. *chava* (Andersen, p. 99).

This is how the initial *ś* changes in Tamil and Malayāḷam. There is a difference of opinion about the pronunciation of the initial *c*, be it in a tadbhava or a pure Tamil word. Some contend that *c* is always voiceless. But one who has observed the pronunciation of *c* by various classes is inclined to hold that the pronunciation of it as a voiceless palatal affricate is vulgar and unrefined in the present age.

There is also another pronunciation of it as dental *s*, observable among certain classes of people all over the Tamil country. They hold it to be a more refined mode of pronouncing *c*. But this change itself is perhaps due to the same influences that are at work in Telugu and Kanarese. For in these languages the Sanskrit *ś* becomes *s*.

S. *śuddha-*, 'clean'; Te. *suddamu*; Ka. *sudda*.

S. *śālā-*, 'a hall'; Te. *sāla*; Ka. *sāle*.

S. *śāṇa-*, 'a whetstone'; Te. *sāna*; Ka. *sāṇe*.

Even the Tamil *c* they transform into *s*.

Ta. *cāvu*, 'death'; Te. *sāvu*; Ka. *sāvu*.

Ta. *cutti*, 'a hammer'; Te. *sutti*; Ka. *suttige*.

It must, however, be remarked here that in Malayāḷam the initial *c* is pronounced distinctly as a voiceless stop. That circumstance may be taken to indicate that Malayāḷam, as well as

the Tamil vulgar dialect so-called referred to above, retains the older pronunciation of *c*.

That there is absolutely no difference between the pronunciation of the Tamil *c*, except when it is doubled, and that of the Sanskrit *ś* may be proved in another way.

S. *cakra-*, 'disc,' is in Tamil *cakkiram* or *cakkaram* (pronounced [śʌkkirəm], [śᴧkkərəm]).

S. *ācāra-*, 'conduct,' is in Tamil *ācāram* (pronounced [a:śa:rəm]). Some people, feeling that when it is a single *c* they do not get the proper Sanskrit pronunciation, write the word as *āccāram*. That indicates that one *c* can give only the *ś* sound. Compare S. *samācāra-*.

In Malayāḷam, however, curiously enough, one hears *ājāram* and *ājamanam*, although the words are written *ācāram* and *ācamanam*, 'sipping water before religious ceremonies.' This peculiarity is found only in the case of words which have a medial *c*. When *c* begins a word, as already pointed out, it is voiceless, unlike the initial *c* in Tamil. This clearly indicates that the medial *c* in Tamil as well as in Malayāḷam must have been originally pronounced as *j*. That the initial *c* must have been originally pronounced as a voiceless stop, has, with the help of Malayāḷam, already been shown. Once the original pronunciation of the medial *c* is taken as established, the change of *ś* to *y* in tadbhavas is easily explained. A transition change of *ś* to *c* and then a change again of *c* to *j* have to be inferred. *j* to *y* is of course a change quite common.

S. *bhuja-*, 'arm'; Ta. *puyam*.

S. *gaja-*, 'an elephant'; Ta. *kayam*.

S. *rājan-*, 'a king'; Ta. *rāyaṉ*.

Malayāḷam shows *vāyakam* from S. *vācaka-*, 'a reader.' It may not be possible to assert that the peculiar pronunciations as indicated by Malayāḷam are the oldest or the original Dravidian pronunciations, but it would be quite safe to say that they are pretty old.

The medial *ś* remains so in Malayāḷam, which has adopted the Sanskrit alphabet, but, in Tamil, is changed into *c*, as when it is initial.

S. *āśā-*, 'desire'; Ta. *ācai*; Ma. *āśa*.

S. *dēśa-*, 'region'; Ta. *tēcam*; Ma. *dēśam*.

S. *pāśa-*, 'a noose'; Ta. *pācam*; Ma. *pāśam*.

The sound does not change, however, in Tamil. It is *ś*, as it is in Sanskrit and Malayāḷam.

But there is another kind of change noticeable in regard to the medial *ś*. It is replaced by *y* in Tamil, and in Malayāḷam too. In view of what was mentioned already, one has to suppose an intermediate form with *c* which must have been pronounced as *j*.

S. *ākāśa-*, 'the sky'; Ta. *ākāyam*.
S. *dēśa-*, 'region'; Ta. *tēyam, tēm*.
S. *paśu-*, 'cattle'; Ta. *pacu*, 'a cow'; Ma. *pai, payi*, 'a cow.'
S. *vaśa-*, 'influence'; Ta. *vayam*; Ma. *vayam*.
S. *śmaśāna-*, 'cemetery'; Ta. *mayānam*; Te. *maśānamu, masanamu*.
S. *śmaśru-*, 'beard'; Ta. *mayir*, 'hair'; Ma. *mayir*.

This kind of change is certainly old, for alongside of these are found in Tamil later forms which indicate only transliteration (i.e., *c* for *ś*). Again, this change is not confined to borrowed words. That is another proof in support of my statement that the medial *c* was pronounced formerly as a voiced stop.

Ta. *paci*, 'hunger'; Ma. *payi*.
Ta. *pāci*, 'moss'; Ma. *pāyal*.
Ta. *pacai*, 'glue'; Ma. *paya*.

It must be noted here that *y* sometimes interchanges with *ś*, or the Tamil medial *c*, as in

Ta. *ayal*, 'neighbourhood'; *acal* (phonetically [ʌśəl]).
Ta. *iyai*, 'agree'; *icai* (phonetically [iśe]).
Ta. *kayam*, 'a spring'; *kacam* (phonetically [kʌśəm]).
Ta. *kuyavaṉ*, 'a potter'; *kucavaṉ* (phonetically [kuśəvən]).
Ta. *payalai*, ; *pacalai* (phonetically [pʌśəle]).
Ta. *puyal*, 'a storm'; *pucal* (phonetically [puśəl]).
Ta. *muyal*, 'a hare'; *mucal* (phonetically [muśəl]).
Ta. *uyir*, 'life'; *ucir* (phonetically [uśir]).

The forms with *ś* are all colloquial. Tamil *ucir* is found in Telugu and Kanarese also: Te. *usuru*; Ka. *usir*.

Initial *ś* is sometimes dropped although this is a common enough phenomenon with *s*.

S. *śaraṇa-*, 'refuge'; Ta. *araṇam, araṇ*, 'a fortress'; M. *araṇ*.
S. *śālā-*, 'an abode'; Ta. *ālai*; M. *āla*.
S. *śmaśāna-*, 'cemetery'; Ta. *mayāṇam*; Pr. *masāṇa* (Pischel, p. 215).

Dr. Gundert suggests S. *araṇya-*, 'forest' as a possible source of *araṇ*. Again he gives S. *śālā-* only as an alternative by the side of S. *ālaya-*. The authors of the Malayāḷam Vyākaraṇa-mitram connect *āla* with S. *śālā-*.

When *ś* occurs, at the beginning of words, in combination with *r*, either *śr* is dropped, or an anaptyctic vowel is inserted between these letters, or the *r* alone is dropped.

S. *śramaṇa-*, 'an ascetic'; Ta. *camaṇaṉ* / *amaṇaṉ* } 'a Jain'; Pa. *samaṇa* (Victor Henry, p. 35).
S. *śraviṣṭha-*, 'name of an asterism'; Ta. *aviṭṭam*; Ma. *aviṭṭam*.
S. *śrāvaka-*, 'a votary'; Ta. *cāvakaṉ*, 'a Jain'; Pa. *sāvaka* (Victor Henry, p. 182).
S. *śravaṇa-* (*śrōṇa*), 'name of an asterism'; Ta. (*tiru-*)*vōṇam*; Ma. *ōṇam*.

S. *śrāvaṇika-*, ' name of a month '; Ta. *āvaṇi*; Ma. *āvani.*

S. *śrāddha-*, ' a funeral rite '; Ta. *cāttam*, *cirāttam*; Ma. *cāttam*

S. *śruti-*, ' the Veda, etc. '; Ta. *curuti*, ' the Veda ', *cuti*, ' harmony in music '; Ma. *curuti*; Te. *suti.*

S. *śrēṇi-*, ' a row '; T. *ēṇi*, ' a ladder ', *cirēṇi*, ' a row ', *cēṇi*; Ma. *ēṇi*, *cēṇi*; Pa. *sēṇi* (Andersen, p. 277).

S. *śrēṣṭhin-*, ' the head of a mercantile guild '; Ta. *ceṭṭi*, ' a merchant '; Ma. *ceṭṭi.*

S. *śrōtra-*, ' the ear '; Ta. *cōttiram.*

The Sanskrit word *śrī-*, ' wealth ' follows a distinct law:

S. *śrī-*; Ta. *tiru*, *cī*, *ciri*; Ma, *tiru*, *tiri*, *tr̥*; *cī*, *ciri* (*acciri* < *aśrī*); *ciru* (*ciruta* < *śrī tē or śridēvi*); Te. *śī.*
tiru is a very old Tamil word but nevertheless admitted to be a tadbhava of *śrī-*. The author of the Telugu dictionary Śabdaratnākaramu regards *tiru* as a *dēśya*, i.e., a Dravidian word. It is usual for the dental *s* to get transformed into *t* in Tamil as is shown elsewhere, here *ś* has become *t.* Another instance pointed out by Dr. Gundert is the Malayāḷam-Tamil *tuyya*, ' pure ' which he derives from *tuyi*, tadbhava of S. *śuci.* Judging from the solitary instances available one is inclined to think that *ś* must have been pronounced *s* before it became *t* thus: *ś* > *s* > *t*. *śrī* > *srī* > *tiru.* That these *ś* and *s* are often confused with *c* is amply borne out by facts. Again, some Sanskrit words have been borrowed through Prakrit, and Prakritic languages have only one *s* to represent all the sibilants. Telugu and Kanarese have the intermediate forms with *s*.

S. *śrī-*; Te. *tiru*, *siri*; Ka. *tira*, *tiri*, *tiru*, *siri.*

Bishop Caldwell, however, says: " *ś*, the soft sibilant of Sanskrit, sometimes passes through similar changes. Generally it is represented by the corresponding *ś* or *ch* of the Dravidian languages, but sometimes it is converted, like the harder *s*, into t, as in the very ancient derivative *tiru*, sacred, for *śrī*." (A comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, 1913, p. 164).

To revert to *tuyya*, Dr. Gundert's derivation of the word from S. *śuci* is not tenable. He is himself not positive about it, having put a mark of interrogation after the word. He connects it rightly with *tū*, which word is found in forms like Ta. *tūya*, *tūymai*. *tuyya* can be directly derived from *tūya*. Compare Ma. *tiyya* from *tīya* (a caste in Malabar).

When *ś* is followed by *c*, *ś* is assimilated to *c*, as it is in Prakrit.

S. *āścarya-*, ' wonder '; Ta. *āccariyam.*

S. *duścārin-*, ' an ill-behaved man '; Ta. *tuccāri.*

S. *niścaya-*, 'certainty'; Ta. *niccaya* / *nikṣaya*; Pr. *nicchaya* (Pischel, p. 206).

S. *niścita-*, 'certainty'; Ta. *niccitam*; Pr. *nicchaya* (Pischel, p. 206).

S. *paścima*, 'western'; Ta. *paccimam*; Ma. *paccima*; Pr. *pacchima* (Pischel, p. 206).

S. *āścarya-* becomes in Prakrit *accariya*. Tamil follows Prakrit only as far as assimilation is concerned. It keeps the long *ā*. Ta. *tuccāri* is found in the Nālaṭiyār. Pischel gives *duccara* corresponding to *duścara-* (p. 206). *Nikṣaya* appears to be an unnatural tadbhava. It is not really a Tamil form but the result of a re-Sanskritization. Pischel gives a similar form derived from S. *paścima-*, *pakṣima* (p. 206). One often meets with *nicciyam* in Tamil colloquial speech. But it is doubtful if it is the Prakrit form of S. *niścita*. It is probably a corruption of Ta. *niccayam*. Ma. *paccima* is found in the Rāmacaritam.

ś followed by *y* takes an anaptyctic vowel or drops the *y*.

S. *śyāmala-*, 'black'; Ta. *ciyāmaḷam*. / *cāmaḷam*.

S. *śyāmalā-*, 'name of a goddess'; Ta. *yāmaḷai* / *cāmaḷai*; Pr. *sāmalā* (Pischel, p. 85).

S. *śyāmaka-*, 'a grain'; Ta. *cāmai*; Ma. *cāma*.

S. *kāśyapa*, 'name of a sage'; Ta. *kācipaṉ*.

Pali has *sāma* from S. *śyāma*. (Andersen, p. 268.) In Ta. *kācipaṉ*, there has not been the mere dropping of *y*. The *y* has influenced the succeeding vowel before it dropped off.

The authors of the Malayālam Vyākaraṇa-mitram give an instance of the dropping off of *l* after *ś*.

S. *ślāghya-*; Ma. *cākkiyar*.

Dr. Gundert thinks that the Malayāḷam word may be a tadbhava of S. *sākṣin-* or *śākya-*. It may be noted that Tamil has *cākki* from S. *śākṣin-*.

When *ś* is followed by *v*, *v* is assimilated to *ś*.

S. *īśvara-*, 'lord'; Ta. *iccuraṉ*. / *icuraṉ*.

When *iśvara-* is used in the name of a place, there is no change of the vowel, e.g., *paṭṭiccaram*. The vowel change is due to the presence of *v* in the word as in *kācipaṉ* above; *v* has suggested *u* as *y* suggested *i*.

But S. *aśva-* becomes in Tamil *accuvam* or *acuvam*. The former is the older form. Words like *accuvam* and *iccuraṉ* would seem to suggest that *ś* medial was once written as *c* and pronounced not as a sibilant but as a voiceless palatal. As according to the rules of Tamil grammar the consonant *c* could not combine with *v*, the anaptyctic vowel *u* appeared when the word had to be used in literary writing. The consonant was doubled with a view to get the proper enunciation, one of them was dropped when the pronunciation of *c* definitely changed into what it is now.

It is also worthy of note that *ś* changes into *ḻ* as in

S. *mārgaśira-*, 'name of a month'; Ta. *mārkaḻi*; Ma. *mārkkaḻi*. As it is common to find *ṣ* changing into *ḻ* in these languages, it may perhaps be inferred that the *r*'s gave the *ś* a *ṣ* sound, and then the change is easily explained. Again, careless pronunciation gives *ś* or even *s* sometimes the sound of *ṣ*.

S. *aṃśa-*, 'part'; Ta. *aṅkiṣam*.

S. *vaṃśa-*, 'family'; Ta. *vaṅkiṣam*.

S. *māṃsa-*, 'meat'; Ta. *māṅkiṣam*.

The name of a king *vaṅkiya-cēkaraṉ* would suggest that S. *vaṃśa-* became also Ta. *vaṅkiśam* (compare Te. *vaṅgasamu*) for such a form only can yield *vaṅkiya* (compare Bengali and Oriya *vaṅśa*). The name in Sanskrit is *vaṃśa-śēkhara*. But what led to the change of *ṃ* to *ṅk*? The Tamil change perhaps indicates that *ṃ* was regarded as an anunāsika. These forms are, however, considered to be not quite literary. The forms *amicam*, *vamicam* and *māmicam* are more commonly found in literature.

The Cerebral Sibilant.

The cerebral *ṣ*, unlike *ś*, has been given a separate symbol adopted from the Grantha alphabet. Still, the sound is recognized to be distinctly foreign to Tamil. And as *ś* and *s* are usually represented by *c*, it being a difficult matter for an ordinary Tamilian to pronounce the sounds properly, *ṣ* also for the same reason is represented by *c* whose value in Tamil either initially or between vowels is always that of *ś*, e.g.,

S. *ṣaṇmukha-*, 'the six faced'; Ta. *caṇmukaṉ.* / *cammukaṉ.*

S. *ṣaṣṭi-*, 'sixty'; Ta. *caṭṭi*, as in *caṭṭipūrtti*.

S. *bhāṣā*, 'language'; *pācai*.

Initial *ṣ* is represented in Malayāḷam as well by *c*.

S. *ṣaḍaṅga-*, 'six auspicious things'; Ta. *caṭaṅku*, 'ceremony'; Ma. *caṭaṅku*.

ṣ in the middle of a word and between vowels changes into *ṭ* (*ḍ*) or *ḷ*. *ḍ* changes into *ḷ* also in the passage of words from Sanskrit into Tamil, e.g.,

S. *piḍā-*, 'pain'; Ta. *piḷai*. *ḍ* is put in as an alternative of *ṭ* as that is the sound-value of the medial *ṭ* in Tamil where it is not doubled. Strictly speaking, the medial *ṭ* has a spirantal sound like the medial *k*, *t* and *p* in Tamil. Where *ṭ* is doubled it has its normal value. And *ṭ* cannot begin a word or end one.

S. *anuṣa-* (?) 'name of an asterism'; Ta. *anuṭam*; Ma. *anuḷam.* / *aniḷam.*

S. *bhāṣā-*, 'language'; Ta. *pāṭai*.

S. *ṛṣabha-*, 'a bull'; Ta. *iṭapam*; Ma. *iṭapam.* / *iṭavam.* / *eṭavam.*

S. *uṣā-*, (*uṣas-*), 'dawn'; Ta. *uḷai.* / *uṭai.*

S. *kaṣāya-*, 'a decoction'; Ta. *kiyāḻam*; Ma. *kaḻāyam*.
S. *kaluṣita-*, 'dirty, muddy'; Ta. *kaluḻi*, 'a flood'.
S. *auṣadha-*, 'medicine'; Ta. *aviḻtam* / *avuṭatam* / *auṭatam*; Ma. *aviḻatam*. *aviṣadham*.
S. *jyōtiṣa-*, 'astronomy'; Ta. *cōtiṭam*. / *jōsyam*. / *cōṣiyam*.
S. *kṣaya-*, 'consumption'; Ma. *kiḻayam*.
S. *mahiṣa-*, 'a buffalo'; Ta. *makiṭam* / *mayiṭam*; Ma. *makiḻam*.
S. *maṣi-*, 'ink'; Ma. *maḻi*.
S. *māṣa-*, 'a particular weight of gold'; Ta. *māḻai* / *māṭai*, 'gold.'
S. *mēṣa-*, 'a ram'; Ta. *mēṭam*. / *mēḻakam*.; Ma. *mēṭam*.
S. *viṣa-*, 'poison'; Ta. *viṭam*; Ma. *viṭam*.
S. *suṣira-*, 'hollow' (Vedic); Ma. *tuḻiram*, 'a hole.'
S. *suṣupti-*, 'sleep'; Ta. *cuḻutti*.
S. *suṣumnā-*, 'an artery'; Ta. *cuḻimunai*. / *cuḻunai*.
S. *śēṣa-*, 'remaining'; Ta. *cēṭam*. / *cēḻam*.
S. *santōṣa-*, 'joy'; Ta. *cantōṭam*; Ma. *tantōḻam*.

It would appear from these examples that the change *ṣ* > *ḻ* is older than *ṣ* > *ṭ*. As a rule all the forms with *ḻ* are older in Tamil literature. Ma. *iṭavam* is found in the Rāmacaritam. Ma. *makiḻam* is found in the same work in the phrase *makiḻanāśini*.

S. *anuṣa-* as the name of the 17th lunar mansion is not found in Apte's Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary or the Vācaspatyam. The Vaijayanti of Yādavaprakāśa gives *anuṣa* in the sense of demon. The word given is *anurādhā*. But Dr. Gundert has given in his Malayāḷam Dictionary *aniḻam* as a tadbhava, and suggests that it is from S. *anuṣa-* and is a medical term. He gives below that word *anuḻam*, 'the 17th constellation.' The Tamiḻccollakarāti published by the Madura Tamil Sangham gives Ta. *anuṭam* as a tadbhava of S. *anuṣa-*, which word is not found in Sanskrit dictionaries, as already pointed out.

Besides *pāṭai*, there is another tadbhava from S. *bhāṣā-*, viz., *pācai*, 'a curse.' Ta. *uḻai* is found used in Villiputtūrar's Bhāratam and *uṭai* in Aracakēcari's Rakuvamicam. Ta. *kiyāḻam* is used only in Madras and the adjacent districts. The Tamil Sangham Dictionary does not recognize it. There has been also metathesis in the word, *y* and *s* have changed places. And *i* in place of *a* is justified by the popular pronunciation of the Sanskrit word even in the south as *kṣāyam*. Once the word is hyper-Sanskritized that way, the anaptyctic vowel comes in all right. Compare Ta. *sundiram* from S. *sundara-* through **sundram*. Ta. *kaluḻi* is found in the

Kuriñcippāṭṭu (l. 178). Ma. *aviḻatam* is straight enough, only *i* has been substituted for *u*. Ta. *aviḻtam* is a little puzzling. Did Ta. *amiḻtam*, a tadbhava of S. *amṛta-* suggest this word? Possibly: for learned men have always regarded *aviḻtam* as *amiḻtam*. Compare the common word Ta. *maruntu*, 'a medicine,' which is considered to have been employed in the sense of nectar in the Konraivēntaṉ (*maruntāyiṉum viruntōtuṇ*=Be it nectar, share it with guests). Ta. *jōsyam* or *jōsiyam*, and *cōṣiyam* are found in colloquial speech, the former in the speech of the higher castes, and the latter in vulgar speech. In the case of Ta. *jōsiyam*, the *s* of S. *jyōtiṣa-* must have been pronounced as a palatal *ś*, and *s* indicates the reverse of the usual change *s* > *t*. In Ta. *cōṣiyam*, the dental *ṣ* has been cerebralized.

S. *suṣira* means a hollow in the Ṛg-vēda (Grassman: Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda, p. 1556).

Ta. *cuḻutti* is a word used only in philosophical works. Ta. *cuḻimunai* also belongs to that category and is used to denote the place of union for the breath of both nostrils.

Ta. *cēḻam* is colloquial in Tinnevelly.

Ma. *tantōḻam* is found in the Rāmacaritam.

In form the Tamil letter *ḻ* (ழ) so much resembles the Tamil-grantha *ṣ* (ஷ) that often some people mistake the one for the other. S. *bhāṣā-* which becomes in Tamil *pāṣai* is often found written by schoolboys *paḻai*. Sometimes in laying stress on the *ḻ* in a word, people are heard to pronounce it as *ṣ*, e.g. *maḻai*, *vaḻukku*. This kind of pronunciation is perhaps peculiar to Tanjore and the neighbouring districts, as M. Julien Vinson points out (Manuel de La Langue Tamoule, Grammaire, p. 18). He would equate it with the French *j*. This probably explains the old system of transliterating *ḻ* by *zh*, followed even today by people trained in old methods. Such a pronunciation, however, can be regarded only as a dialectal variety and cannot be allowed to have any better title for consideration than the pronunciation of *ḻ* as *ḷ* current in the far south, or as *y* current in Madras and some western districts.

As has been already noted, the medial *ṣ* changes also into *c*. The change, however, is comparatively modern. In Telugu it changes into *s* dental.

S. *mōṣa-*, 'theft,' 'stealing'; Ta. *mōcam*; Ma. *mōśam*; Te. *mōsamu*.

S. *dōṣa-*, 'a fault,' 'sin'; Ta. *tōṭam* / *tōcam* ; Te. *dōsamu*.

S. *manuṣya-*, 'a man'; Ta. *manucaṉ*.

S. *maṣi-*, 'ink'; Ta. *maci*.

S. *māṣa-*, 'a particular weight of gold'; T. *mācai*.

The word *mōsa* is found in Kanarese too. It is perhaps a Dravidian word. Dr. Kittel regards it as such. Dr. Gundert,

however, regards it as a tadbhava and even gives a variant form *mōcam* in Malayāḷam. The difficulty lies in connecting it with any other word in Tamil. One has to note a peculiarity with regard to the sound-value of the medial *c* in these borrowed words. The value is usually that of *ś* palatal or *s* dental. But sometimes the characteristic value of the medial *c*, i.e., that of *j*, has affected some of these, e.g., *maci* has an alternative form *mai* (through *mayi*). Ta. *tōcam* occurs in the Jīvakacintāmaṇi and *maci* in the Cūḷāmaṇi. A class of people are heard to say *maniyaṉ*, which is no doubt derived from *manucaṉ*, the intermediate form being *manicaṉ*. And *manicaṉ* could yield *manitaṉ* if the medial *c* was pronounced as a dental *s*. Bishop Caldwell, however, says: "*manusya*, Sans. man, becomes in classical Tamil *māniḍa-n*; and this by a further change becomes *maniḍa-n*." (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, p. 163.) Against this it may be urged that *māniḍaṉ* is a comparatively recent word and is not found in the earlier works. As regards the change of *u* to *i*, it has been pointed out elsewhere that the pronunciation of *u* in such words is not distinct and borders on that of *i*.

S. *viṣama-*, 'unevenness'; Ta. *viyamam*.

S. *vaiṣṇava-*, 'a Viṣṇu-worshipper'; Ta. *vaiṇavaṉ*.

The first example is from the Kalittokai, a Tamil classic. That, of course, indicates that there must have been an intermediate stage when *viṣama* remained *vicama* and the medial *c* then became *y*. Similarly *vaiṣṇava* must have first become *vaiciṇavaṉ*, *vaciṇavaṉ* which forms do not exist (cp. S. *vaiśya-*, Ta. *vaciyaṉ*; also S. *paiśāca-*, Ta. *pacācam* and even *pācam* in the Patiṟṟuppattu, a Tamil classic), and then passed on to *vayiṇavaṉ* which is only another mode of writing *vaiṇavaṉ*.

When *ṣ* occurs either at the beginning or in the middle of words in combination with voiceless stops, particularly the velar *k*, it is either assimilated or undergoes some other change.

S. *kṣaṇa-*, 'an instant'; Ta. *kaṇam*; Pr. *khaṇa* (Pischel, p. 221). Pa. *khaṇa* (Andersen, p. 81).

S. *kṣamā-*, 'patience; Ta. *kamai*; Pa. *chamā* (Victor Henry, p. 169.)

S. *kṣaya-*, 'a disease in general'; Ta. *kayam*, 'consumption'; Ma. *kiḷayam*; Pa. *khaya* (Andersen, p. 82).

S. *kṣāra-*, 'pungent'; Ta. *kāram*; Ma. *kāram*; Pr. *khāra* (Pischel, p. 221).

S. *kṣāma-*, 'destruction'; Ta. *cāmam*, 'famine'; Ma. *cāmam*.

S. *kṣīra-*, 'milk'; Ta. *kīram*; Pa. *khīra* (Andersen, p. 83); Pr. *khīra* (Pischel, p. 220).

S. *kṣēma-*, 'well-being'; Ta. *cēmam* / *ēmam*; Ma. *kēmam*; Pa. *khēmam* (Andersen, p. 84).

S. *akṣa-*, 'an axle'; Ta. *accu*; Ma. *accu*.

S. *akṣara-*, 'a letter'; Ta. *akkaram*; Ma. *akkaram*; Pa. *akkharam* (Andersen, p. 10); Pr. *akkharam* (Pischel, p. 236).

S. *kakṣa-*, 'the arm-pit'; Ta. *kakkam*; Pr. *kakkha* (Pischel, p. 219).

S. *kukṣi-*, 'the belly'; Ta. *kukki*; Pr. *kukkhi* (Pischel, p. 221); Pa. *kucchi* (Andersen, p. 78).

S. *takṣan-*, 'a carpenter'; Ta. *taccaṉ*; Ma. *taccan*.

S. *pakṣa-*, 'a side'; Ta. *pakkam*; Ma. *pakkam*; Te. *pakkamu*; Pa. *pakkha* (Andersen, p. 147).

S. *bhikṣā-*, 'alms'; Ta. *piccai*; Ma. *picca*; Te. *biccamu*.

S. *yakṣa-*, 'a demi-god'; Ta. *(i-)yakkaṉ*; Pa. *yakkha* (Andersen, p. 212).

S. *dakṣiṇa-*, 'the south'; Ta. *takkaṇam* / *takkiṇam* ; Te. *dakkiṇamu*.

These changes, although usually found in Prakrit or Pali, may not altogether be due to the influence of either of these. The same laws that operated in the case of Prakrit and Pali might have operated in the Dravidian languages as well. Still the change of *kṣ* to *k* or *kk* seems to be foreign to Tamil if one is to judge by the popular pronunciation of today. S. *kṣaṇa-* = *caṇam*; S. *kṣaya-* = *cayam*. *cāmam* and *cēmam* are words in every day use. Again S. *akṣara-* = *accara*. The words *taccaṉ* and *piccai* indicate the characteristic Dravidian change.

The change of S. *kṣaya-* into *kiḻayam* in Malayāḷam is peculiar. Bishop Caldwell says: "*ṣ* is sometimes, though rarely, converted in Tamil into *ḷ*. Dr. Gundert supplies me with some instances of this in old Malayāḷam, e.g., *kṣaya*, Sans. 'loss,' is in old Mal. written *kiḻayam*, and the name *lakṣmaṇan* in an old copy of the Rāmāyaṇa is written *ilaḷkkaṇan*. Here *ḷkk* stands for *kṣ*" (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, p. 163). In this change, *kṣaya* must have first got the anaptyctic *i* for facility of pronunciation and then *ṣ* became *ḻ* as in several similar cases. The presence of *ḷ* in *Ilaḷkkaṇan* is unintelligible. In the Ms. of the Ramacaritam I examined I remember to have seen only *Ilakkaṇan* without the *ḷ*, if I may rely on my notes. The Tamil form is *Ilakkuvaṉ*. If there is an *ḷ* in any Ms., that has to be accounted for by the anxiety of the scribe or even the reader to see that *ṣ* was represented by the usual substitute *ḷ*.

Ta. *ēmam* is possibly an old tadbhava. It is used in the sense of protection, prison, etc. If it is a tadbhava, the initial sibilant must have dropped off.

S. *kakṣa-* also appears as *kaṣkam* in colloquial Tamil. This must be a re-Sanskritized false form from Ta. *kakkam*. Pischel gives instances of *kṣ* changing in Prakrit into *śk*, *pakṣa* = *paśka* (p. 222).

The Tamil *takkaṉ* is a recent tadbhava from S. *dakṣa-*, 'name of a Prajāpati'; *taccaṉ* is a very old word. The trade itself is known as *taccu*.

cāmam in Tamil, as well as Malayāḷam, is also a tadbhava of S. *yāma-*, 'a period of three hours' through the Prakrit *jāma*.

Again,

S. *pakṣin-*, 'a bird'; Ta. *paṭci* } ; Ma. *pakki*; Te. *pakki*; Ka.
pakki }
hakki; Pa. *pakkhin*. (Andersen, p. 147).

S. *sākṣin-*, 'a witness'; Ta. *cāṭci* } ; Te. *sākiri*.
cākki }

In the case of *paṭci* and *cāṭci* it should be observed that *ṭc* is but a mode of transcribing *kṣ* in Tamil. Any word with *kṣ* may be written with *ṭc* instead, e.g., S. *nakṣatra-*, 'a star'; Ta. *naṭcattiram*. It must be mentioned, however, that elegant pronunciation of words transcribed thus would make *c* sound like *ṣ*. And in vulgar pronunciation *ṭ* is assimilated to the succeeding *c* and both together are sounded like a doubled palatal *cc*. There are two exceptions to this mode of transcription among the words given above, viz., *accu* and *taccaṉ*. They are completely Tamilized.

When *ṣ* follows *r*, an anaptyctic vowel seems to be a necessity. *ṣ* of course, in accordance with the general law, is changed into *ṭ* (*ḍ*).

S. *ākarṣaṇa-*, 'attracting'; Ta. *ākaruṭaṇam*.

S. *ārṣa-*, 'relating to the ṛṣis'; Ta. *āriṭam*.

S. *varṣa-*, 'a year'; Ta. *varuṭam*; Ma. *variṣam*.

The same phenomenon is noticeable in cases where *ṣ* follows the vowel *ṛ*.

S. *ṛṣi-*, 'a sage'; Ta. *iruṭi*.

The popular form is, of course, *rici* (phonetically [riśi].) Compare S. *ṛṣabha-*, 'a bull'; Ta. *iṭapam*; Ma, *eṭavam*. In this case also the popular form in Tamil is *ricapam* (phonetically [riśəʋəm]).

ṣ followed by *k* is assimilated. It is so in Pali.

S. *śuṣka-*, 'dried up'; Ta. *cukku*, 'dried ginger'; Ma. *cukku*.

S. *catuṣka-*, 'a crossway'; Ta. *catukkam* }
cavukkam, 'a square' }

cukku and *catukkam* are good old words. *catukkam* is a classical word (Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai, l. 225), but people who know the origin sometimes write it *catuṭkam*. That is pedantry. Compare S. *catuṣkikā-* = *cadukkiā* (Pischel, p. 206). *cavukkam* is distinctly borrowed through Prakrit (Pischel, p. 206, *catuṣka* = *caükka*).

But there are instances where *ṣ* is changed into *ṭ* unaffected by the succeeding *k*.

S. *puṣkala-*, 'abundant'; Ta. *puṭkalam*.

S. *puṣkariṇi-*, 'a piece of water'; Ta. *puṭkariṇi* }
puṭkaraṇi }

The change of *i* to *a* in *puṭkaraṇi* is perhaps due to Pali influence. (Pa. *pokkharaṇī*. Andersen, p. 183). The Prakrit forms are only *pokkhariṇī* and *pukkhariṇī*. (Pischel, p. 100.)

ṣ followed by *ṭ* is assimilated. That is also the natural change in other combinations.

S. *iṣṭa-*, 'wish'; Ta. *iṭṭam*; Ma. *iṭṭam*; Pr. *iṭṭha* (Pischel, p. 207).

S. *jyēṣṭhā-*, 'eldest sister'; Ta. *cēṭṭai*; Ma. *cēṭṭa*.

S. *jyēṣṭhā-*, 'name of an asterism'; Ta. *kēṭṭai*; Ma. *kēṭṭa*.

S. *diṣṭa-*, 'assignment'; Ta. *tiṭṭam*; Ma. *tiṭṭam*.

S. *naṣṭa-*, 'loss'; Ta. *naṭṭam*; Ma. *naṭṭam*; Pa. *naṭṭha* (Andersen, p. 132).

S. *vēṣṭ-*, 'to dress'; Ta. *vēṭṭi*, 'a cloth'; Ma. *vēṭṭi*.

S. *viṣṭi-*, 'unpaid labour'; Ta. *veṭṭi*; Te. *veṭṭi*; Pr. *viṭṭhi*, *veṭṭhi* (Pischel, p. 207).

S. *śrēṣṭhin-*, 'the head of a mercantile guild'; Ta. *ceṭṭi*, 'a merchant'; Ma. *ceṭṭi*; Te. *seṭṭi*, *śeṭṭi*; Pr. *seṭṭhi* (Pischel, p. 217); Pa. *seṭṭhi* (Andersen, p. 276).

Some dialects of Tamil and Telugu have forms like *vēsṯi*, and *nasṯam* where *ṣ* becomes a kind of alveolar *s* in spite of the presence of *ṭ*, changing the *ṭ* also into an alveolar *t*. Compare Prakrit *kasṭa* = S. *kaṣṭa-* (Pischel, p. 207). Strictly speaking separate symbols are required to represent these alveolar *s* and *t*. They may perhaps be indicated by a dash underneath as the other alveolar symbols *ḻ*, *ṟ*, and *ṉ* of Tamil.

The change of S. *śrēṣṭhin-* to Ta. *ceṭṭi* does not follow the rules of Tamil grammar like another word *kaṭṭai*, a tadbhava of S. *kāṣṭha-*. These forms must be ascribed to Prakrit or Pali influence. Only that can account for the long *e* becoming short *e* before the double *ṭṭ*. There is, again, a word in Tamil *ceṭṭu* meaning frugality, and this word might possibly have given the personal noun *ceṭṭi*. But the difficulty in deriving *ceṭṭu* and the Telugu tadbhavas would induce one to conclude that it was formed from *ceṭṭi* as *taccu* was formed from *taccaṉ*.

jyēṣṭhā- becomes *cēṭṭai* when it means 'eldest sister,' also when it means 'the goddess of misfortune,' and *kēṭṭai* when it means 'the eighteenth lunar mansion.'

It is curious that *ṣ* before *ṇ*, too, changes into *ṭ*, although the words undergo further changes before they are incorporated in the Tamil vocabulary.

S. *kṛṣṇa-*, 'an avatar of Viṣṇu'; Ta. *kiruṭṭiṉaṉ* / *kiṭṭaṉ* / *kuṭṭaṉ* / *kaṇṇaṉ*; Ma. *kuṭṭan*. Pa. *kaṇha* (Andersen, p. 66); Pr. *kaṇha* (Pischel, p. 215).

S. *viṣṇu-*, 'the god of protection'; Ta. *viṭṭuṇu* / *viṭṭu* / *vinṭu*; Ma. *viṇṇu*. Ka. *viṭṭu*; Pr. *viṇhu* (Pischel, p. 215).

kiṭṭaṉ and *viṭṭu* are easily derived by the dropping of the succeeding *ṇ* with a view to shorten the words. It may be interesting to see that in colloquial Telugu we find *kiṣṭa* which cannot be explained by saying that *ṇ* changed into *ṭ*, but rather that *ṇ* dropped off while the *ṭ* inherent between *ṣ* and *ṇ* (though unrepresented in writing) remained. *vinṭu* is perhaps a nasalized form of *viṭṭu*. It may also be regarded as a case of metathesis *viṭṇu* > *vinṭu*.

The Malayāḷam *viṇṇu* is given here on the authority of Dr. Gundert, who writes under the word: "T.M. Te. (Te. also *miṉ* from *min*?; rather Tdbh. of *viṣṇu*)" and gives as meanings 'the sky, heaven'. The Prakrit *viṇhu* seems to lend support to Dr. Gundert's derivation. But one would expect *viṇṇu*, 'the sky' to be connected with the Tamil word *viṉ* which is again derivable from *viḷ*, 'to open'. Compare the de-cerebralized Te. *vinnu*. Bishop Caldwell has a remark on this very word. He says: "Sometimes *ṣ* is assimilated to a succeeding *ṇ*—e.g., the name *Viṣṇu* becomes sometimes, both in poetical Tamil and in Malayāḷam, *Viṇṇu*. This name appears also in poetical Tamil as *viṇṭu*, a word which denotes the wind as well as *viṣṇu*. Dr. Gundert identifies the *viṇ* of *viṇṇu*, 'Viṣṇu', with the Tam.-Mal. word *viṉ*, 'sky', a true Tamil word connected with the root *viḷ*, 'to be bright'. The derivation of *Viṣṇu* from *viḷ* and *viṉ* looks very tempting, but I fear Sanskrit lexicographers will refuse to yield to the temptation." (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, page 163.) Judged by the dictionary from which I have quoted, published in 1872, three years before the date of the publication of Bishop Caldwell's Grammar, second edition, Dr. Gundert would rather derive *viṇṇu* from S. *viṣṇu-*. And *viṇṇu* in the sense of Viṣṇu is unknown to Tamil literature. *kuṭṭaṉ* may be ascribed to the peculiar pronunciation of *ṛ* which yields *ru* as in *iruṭi* > *ṛṣi*. The Telugu people of some districts pronounce *gṛha-* as *gruha*, and *kṛṣṇa-* as *kruṣṇa*. Some Tamil scholars in the vicinity of Madras have been heard to refer to Sanskrit as *samskrutam*. The old Tamil word *amutu* indicates this pronunciation, being derived from S. *amṛta-*. Dr. Gundert does not give the Malayāḷam *kuṭṭaṉ* as a tadbhava of S. *kṛṣṇa-*. Evidently he connects it with *kuṭṭi* which is ultimately derived from *kuḷ*. But the word as a personal name is common in Malayāḷam, and is held to be a corruption of S. *kṛṣṇa-*.

S. *tīkṣṇa-*, 'sharp, warm'; Ta. *tītcaṇam* } *tīkṣaṇyam* }

In *tītcaṇam*, the anaptyctic vowel is the only peculiarity. *kṣ* > *tc* is quite common, as already pointed out. *tīkṣaṇyam* is a false Sanskrit form evidently derived by analogy with such words as *tākṣaṇyam*, *vikṣaṇyam*, etc.

S. *uṣṇa-*, 'heat, warmth; Ta. *uṭṭaṇam* } *uṭṭiṇam* }

The inherent *ṭ* referred to above is distinctly visible here, *uṣṇam* by pronunciation is *uṣṭṇam*, then *uṭṭaṇam* or *uṭṭiṇam*. Compare the English *Kistna*, 'name of a district in the Madras Presidency' which is only *kṛṣṇa* in the vernacular.

ṣ followed by *p* is assimilated, or changed into *ṭ*.

S. *śaṣpa-*, 'grass'; Ma. *cappu*, 'leaf'; Pr. *sappha* (Pischel, p. 209).

S. *puṣpa-*, 'a flower'; Ta. *puṭpam*; Pr. *puppha* (Pischel, p. 209).

S. *puṣparāga-*, 'a topaz'; Ta. *puṭparākam* / *puruṭarākam*; Ka. *puṣyarāgam*; Ma. *puṣyarāgam*.

The Tamil *puṭpam* is often pronounced as if it were written *puppam*. It is also noteworthy that some people pronounce it as *puyippam*. That is regarding *ṣ* as *ś*, for *ś* is interchangeable with *y*, e.g., *kāśā, kāyā*; *iśal, īyal*. Of course *ś* became first *c* and the medial *c* is found to have been pronounced as *j*, then from this arose *y*. Ta. *puṭparākam* is plain enough. How *puruṭarākam* is obtained either from *puṣparāga-*, common in Sanskrit, or even from the Ma.- Ka. alternative form *puṣyarāgam*, it is difficult to see Ta. *puruṭarākam* is found in the Cūṭāmaṇi-nikaṇṭu (XII, 104).

ṣ followed by *m*.

S. *duṣmanta-*, 'Duṣyanta, a king'; Ta. *tuṭṭantaṉ*.

S. *bhīṣma-*, 'a Bhārata hero'; Ta. *viṭṭumaṉ*.

bhiṣma- is simply explained, changing as *viṣṇu*, and *bh* first becoming *b*, then *v* In the case of *duṣmanta-*, the disappearance of *m* is inexplicable except by the usual change of *m* to *v*, and the final assimilation of *v* as in S. *khaṭvāṅga-*, 'a club with a skull at the top'; Ta. *kaṭṭaṅkam*.

S. *sūkṣma-*, 'subtle'; Ta. *cūkkumam* / *cūkkam*

The word first became *cūkṣumam* with an anaptyctic vowel between *ṣ* and *m*, and then *cūkkumam*. The other form was obtained by a kind of assimilation which may be termed Haplology. There is another form which may perhaps be called a re-Sanskritized form, *cūkṣam* or *cūṭcam*, 'a trick'. Malayāḷam also has *sūkṣam* and Dr. Gundert gives the meanings 'minute, subtle,' and 'care'. It has also formed a verb from the word, *sūkṣikka*, 'to watch'.

S. *grīṣma-*, 'the summer'; Ta. *kirīṭṭumam* / *kirīṭam*

kiriṭṭumam is like *viṭṭumam* explained above, only the anaptyctic vowel came in to make *grī kirī*.

S. *lakṣmaṇa-*, 'a brother of Rāma'; Ta. *ilakkumaṇaṉ* / *ilakkuvaṉ*; Ma. *ilakkaṇan*.

S. *lakṣmī-*, 'the goddess of fortune'; Ta. *ilakkumi* / *lekṣumi* / *lecci* / *ecci*; Te. *lacci*; Pr. *lacchī* (Pischel, p. 216).

Ta. *ilakkuvaṉ* is clearly derived from *ilakkumaṇaṉ*, *m* changing into *v* and *ṇa* being assimilated. There are also popular forms like *leccumaṇaṉ* and *lekṣumaṇaṉ* corresponding to the tadbhavas of S. *lakṣmi-*. This vowel-change *a* > *e* is peculiar to Tamil and is common in words beginning with unaspirated voiced stops and liquids, e.g., *keṇēcaṉ* [genɛ:śən] *ceyam* [džɛjəm], *terittiram* [dɛridrəm], *pelam* [bɛləm], *yemaṉ*, *reṅkaṉ* [rɛəgən]. Except *ceyam*

and *pelam*, these examples are only heard in popular speech. People write the words all right although they pronounce them with an *e*. The explanation would appear to be that people who pronounce so pronounce *a* as a diphthong *æ* and hence we hear an *e*. Really it is not a clear *e*. Compare also the pronunciation of the Malayāḷam speaking people in regard to words with a medial *r* followed by *a*, which I observed as peculiar, e.g. *kuraññu*, 'a monkey,' *pūram*, 'name of a lunar mansion.'

In the case of *lecci*, *m* has been lost by assimilation, and in (*y*-)*ecci* the loss of the initial consonant may be noticed. Ma. *ilakkaṇan* has been dealt with in another connexion.

S. *ślēṣman-*, 'phlegmatic humour'; Ta. *cilēttumam*;
cēṭṭumam;
cēttumam, *cēṟṟumam*;
cilēppaṉam;
cilēṟpaṉam, *cēṟpaṉam*;
cēṟpam, *cēppaṉam*.

Ma. *culēṉṉam*; Pr. *sēpha* (Pischel, p. 185).

It looks curious that this Sanskrit word of all should have so many tadbhavas in Tamil. But this is a word that cannot escape being used oftener than any other, indicating as it does the humour that kills. When the *ślēṣma-dhātu* makes its presence felt, then it is a sure sign that death is knocking at the gate. Considering the circumstances in which the word is employed, one cannot be surprised at the changes the original Sanskrit word has undergone. *cilēṭṭumam* is formed after the model of *viṭṭumaṉ*, or *kiriṭṭumam*. In *cēṭṭumam*, we have assimilation. *Cēṟṟumam* is a case in which the cerebral *ṭ* becomes an alveolar *t*. There is absolutely no difference in pronunciation between a double *tt* and a double *ṟṟ*. The double *ṟṟ* often, we may say almost invariably, becomes *tt*, e.g., *kāṟṟu*> *kāttu*. S. *ślēṣman-* must have been pronounced with a dental medial *s* before it became *cilēṟpaṉam*. Compare S. *bhasman-*, Ta. *paṟpam*. *cēppaṉam*, *cēṟpaṉam* and *cēṟpam* point to assimilation. Compare the Prakrit form *sēpha*. *cilēppaṉam* also got *pp* by assimilation of *ṟ* to *p*.

S. *bhāṣya-* 'a commentary'; Ta. *pāṭiyam*.
S. *puṣya-* 'name of an asterism'; Ta. *pūcam*; Ma. *pūyam*.
S. *lakṣya-* 'an aim'; Ta. *(i-)lakkiyam*, 'poetical literature.'
(i-)lakku, 'aim.'

Ta. *pāṭiyam* is plain enough. Ta. *pūcam* may perhaps be regarded as a case of compensatory lengthening. The vowel *u* is lengthened to compensate for the loss of *y*. Ma. *pūyam* must have been derived from Tamil when the medial *c* was pronounced as *j*. The *i* in the Tamil forms of S. *lakṣya-* is prothetic. Ta. *ilakku* may be derived from *ilakkiyam*, but the process is not plain. It seems likely that there was another tadbhava *ilakkam* from S. *lakṣa-*, 'aim,' which led in course of time to the formation of *ilakku* by the dropping of

the final *-am*. There is, of course, a Ta. *ilakkam* which means 'number.' Brown's Telugu Dictionary (second edition) gives the corresponding Telugu word *lekka* and suggests that it is a pure Telugu word when it means 'number' and makes it a tadbhava of S. *lakṣya-* when it means 'esteem.' I am inclined to think that 'number' and 'esteem' are closely related and that both are denoted by the tadbhava of S. *lakṣya-*. Compare also Ta. *eṉ* which means 'to count' as well as 'to regard, to think,' etc., and again Ta. *mati* which means 'to estimate or appraise' as well as 'to regard.' The noun *matippu* means 'estimate' as well as 'esteem.' Ta. *ilakkam*, 'a lakh' is also a tadbhava of S. *lakṣa-*.

The Dental Sibilant.

The dental *s*, like the cerebral *ṣ*, has been given in the Tamil alphabet a separate symbol adopted from the Grantha alphabet. This symbol, however, did not exist as a letter of the Tamil alphabet in the earlier language. Even today the dental *s* is popular only in the case of words where it occurs as part of conjunct consonants, e.g., *pustakam, stirī.*

Ordinarily the dental *s* is represented in Tamil or Malayāḷam by the palatal *c* which letter is in fact made to answer, as has been shown already, for *ś* and *ṣ* as well, being the nearest phonetic representative.

S. *simha-*, 'a lion'; Ta. *ciṅkam*; Ma. *ciṅṅam.*

S. *sindūra-*, 'red lead'; Ta. *cinturam*; Ma. *cintūram.*

S. *sanghāta-*, 'association'; Ta. *caṅkāttam*; Ma. *caṅṅātam*

S. *sēvaka-*, 'a servant'; Ta. *cēvakaṉ* / *cekuvaṉ* ; Ma. *cēvakan.*

S. *svāti-*, 'name of an asterism'; Ta. *cōti*; Ma. *cōti.*

Such words as *sāvu*, 'death', *soṟa*, 'a shark', *sōna*, 'rain' in Telugu corresponding to *cāvu, cuṟā* and *cōṉai* of Tamil, and again such words as *sāvu*, 'death', *sōne*, 'incessant drizzle', *suttu*, 'surround' in Kanarese corresponding to *cāvu, cōṉai*, and *cuṟṟu* of Tamil, prove that the sound of *c* is related to that of *s*, and Telugu and Kanarese with their enlarged alphabets have preferred to represent it by the latter symbol in the words shown. That the sound of *s* is adopted for *c* by some classes even among Tamils has been shown already.

Ta. *cōti* is also the tadbhava form of S. *jyōtiṣ-*.

One would expect the dental *s* to change into the dental *t* judging from the close relationship to each other and the difficulty of pronouncing the spirant for children and untrained people. And so it does. In Tamil the change is not common at the beginning of a word whereas Malayāḷam can supply a number of instances. They are mostly from the Rāmacaritam, the oldest Malayāḷam work extant.

S. *satkāra-*, 'hospitable reception'; Ma. *takkāram.*

S. *santati-*, 'progeny'; Ma. *tantati.*
S. *santōṣa-*, 'delight'; Ma. *tantōḻam.*
S. *sambandha-*, 'relation'; Ma. *tammantam.*
S. *sāyaka-*, 'an arrow'; Ma. *tāyakam.*
S. *sārathi-*, 'a charioteer'; Ma. *tārati.*
S. *suraṅga-*, 'a mine'; Ma. *turaṅkam.*
S. *sōdara-*, 'a uterine brother'; Ma. *tōtaran.*
S. *sēnā-*, 'an army'; Ta. *tāṉai*; Ma. *tēna.*

The change of *ē* to *ā* in Ta. *tāṉai* is somewhat difficult to explain. Compare Te. *ēnugu* and Ta. *āṉai.* There is another instance in Tamil illustrating this change of *s* to *t* which is of doubtful validity. In Tamil one meets with the word *tattiyam* which may be taken as a tadbhava of S. *satya-.* But there is in Sanskrit *tathya-* which means 'truth, reality'. That obviates the need for formulating any change of *s* to *t* with regard to that word.

Proper names also seem to have been affected by this change.

S. *sampāti-*, 'name of a fabulous bird in the Rāmāyaṇa'; Ma. *tampāti.*
S. *samīraṇa-*, 'air'; Ma. *tamīraṇan.*
S. *sumitrā-*, 'one of the wives of Daśaratha'; Ma. *tumittirai.*

It may be noted in this connexion that Prakrit shows this change in regard to *c.* Pr. *tigicchā* < S. *cikitsā-* (Pischel, p. 224).

When *s* occurs in the middle of a word between vowels, the change is found as often in Tamil as in Malayāḷam.

S. *asi-*, 'a sword'; Ma. *ati.*
S. *asura-*, 'a demon'; Ma. *aturan.*
S. *āyāsa-*, 'fatigue'; Ma. *āyātam.*
S. *āsana-*, 'seat'; Ta. *ātaṉam.*
S. *kusuma-*, flower'; Ma. *kutumam.*
S. *dāsa-*, 'a servant'; Ta. *tātaṉ*; Ma. *tātan.*
S. *nāsikā-*, 'the nose'; Ma. *nātika.*
S. *nivāsa-*, 'a house'; Ma. *nivātam.*
S. *māsa-*, 'a month'; Ta. *mātam.*
S. *musala-*, 'a club'; Ma. *mutalam.*
S. *vasiṣṭha-*, 'name of a sage'; Ta. *vatiṭṭaṉ.*
S. *vilāsa-*, 'sport'; Ma. *vilātam.*
S. *vyāsa-*, 'name of a sage'; Ta. *viyātaṉ*; Ma. *viyātan.*
S. *rasa-*, 'juice'; Ta. *iratam*; Ma. *iratam.*
S. *śvāsa-*, 'breath'; Ta. *cuvātam.*
S. *śāsana-*, 'a deed'; Ta. *cātaṉam.*

Most of the Malayāḷam forms are taken from the Ramacaritam. Ta. *iratam* is also a tadbhava of S. *ratha-*, 'a car.' Ta. *cuvātam* occurs in Villīputtūrar's Bhāratam. Ta. *cātaṉam* is also a tadbhava of S. *sādhana-*, 'a means.' This change of *s* to *t* is sometimes found among Dravidian words themselves; thus Ta. *ōcai* is also written as *ōtai.* *s* of course becomes *c* by transliteration. Malayāḷam has

the forms *ōśa*, *ōca*, and *occa*. Again Ta. *kocu*, *kocuku* has another form *kotuku*, while Malayāḷam has *kotu* and *kotuku* only. In the latter case it is hard to determine which is the earlier form. The Tamil word *cuḷai*, 'pulp' is *toḷe* in Kanarese. The Tamil *caraṭu*, 'a cord' is Te. *trāḍu*. Accepting that the forms with *c* are the earlier, one has to theorise, with reference to the early pronunciation of the initial and medial *c* already discussed, on the probable date of this change. The pronunciation of *c* at this stage in the language must have been that of the dental *s*. Perhaps this is comparatively later.

Medial *s* sometimes changes into *y*, like *ś*.

S. vasanta-, 'the spring'; Ta. *vayantam*; Ma. *vayanta*.

The Tamil form presupposes a form *vacantam* in which *c* was pronounced as *j*. Ta. *vayantam* is a pretty old word. The modern form is *vacantam* in which *c* is pronounced as *ś*. The tendency of the Tamil-speaking people in Trichinopoly and the neighbouring places to substitute *y* for *c* (*ś*) even in Tamil words, as e.g., *pēcātē* > *pēyāte*, as they pronounce them, would lead one to doubt if the intermediate change of *c* > *j* has to be taken for granted.

The initial *s* followed by stop consonants and nasals generally drops off. Such a combination is not native to Tamil, and *s* in such cases cannot change into *c*.

S. *skanda-*, 'the war-god'; Ta. *kantaṉ*; Te. *kanduḍu*.

S. *stambhana-*, 'restraining'; Ta. *tampaṉam*.

S. *stuti-*, 'praise'; Ta. *tuti*.

S. *stōtra-*, 'praise'; Ta. *tōttiram.* }
cōttam. }

S. *sthūṇā-*, 'a pillar'; Ta. *tūṇ*; Ma. *tūṇ*; Pr. *thūṇā* (Pischel, p. 101).

S. *sthūla-*, 'bulky'; Ta. *tūlam*; Pr. *thūla* (Pischel, p. 101); Pa. *thūla* (Andersen, p. 116).

S. *snāna-*, 'bathing'; Ta. *nāṉam*; Te. *tānamu*.

S. *sparśa-*, 'touch'; Ta. *paricam*; Ma. *pariśam* } (?)
pariyam }

S. *sphaṭika-*, 'crystal'; Ta. *paṭikam*; Ma. *paṭikam*.

S. *smṛti*, 'a law-book'; Ta. *miruti*.

Words recently borrowed keep the *s* on, e.g., S. *strī*, 'a woman,' becomes *stirī*. And most of the above words have been borrowed for a second time with *s* retained. This is true of all tadbhavas. Sanskrit-knowing people in modern times have imported many Sanskrit words with very few changes, e.g., *spaṣṭa-*, 'clear,' *smārta-*, 'name of a sect,' *smāraka*, 'reminding,' *stava-*, 'panegyric.'

The tadbhava *cōttam* which occurs in the Tiruvācakam does not belong to this class of words. Assimilation has been at work in it. There is also in popular speech a re-Sanskritized false form *cōstram*. Compare the colloquial Ta. *cūstra*, a corruption of Ta. *cūttiram*, a tadbhava of S. *sūtra-*. These forms are evidently

formed from analogy with S. *śāstra-*. Te. *tānamu* is a curious tadbhava. Tamil too has *stāna* a dialectal variant corresponding to it. Frequent occurrence of words with *st* must have led by contamination to the formation of this tadbhava.

Dr. Gundert derives Ma. *pariśam* and *pariyam* from S. *sparśa-*. But they do not mean 'touch.' They mean (1) the back part of a house (compare Mar. *parasa*, 'backyard, enclosure of a house'), and (2) a token given by the bridegroom to the bride. Tamil has both the forms, which, however, it uses in the latter sense only. Again, in Tamil classics we have *paricil*, *paricu* which mean 'gift, present,' and it is probable that *paricam* was derived from these by contamination.

Again Tamil has, besides *paṭikam*, *paḷiṅku* derived through Prakrit or Pali. Pischel (p. 148) gives *phaḷiha*, and Andersen (p. 184) *phaḷika*. Tamil has nasalized the Pali form. Malayāḷam has *paḷuṅku*. Telugu has *palugu* with an ardhānusvāra before *-gu* which makes the form almost identical with the Malayāḷam form.

In some words *s* preceding a vowel also has shown a tendency to drop off.

S. *sabhā-*, 'an assembly'; Ta. *avai*.
S. *sandhyā-*, 'twilight'; Ta. *anti*, 'evening'; Ma. *anti*.
S. *samaya-*, 'opportunity'; Ta. *amayam*.
S. *sindhu-*, 'the Indus'; Ta. *intu*; Ma. *intu*.
S. *siṃhala-*, 'Ceylon'; Ta. *īḻam*; Ma. *īḻam*.
S. *sisa-*, 'lead'; Ta. *iyam*; Ma. *iyam*.
S. *sahasra-*, 'a thousand'; Ta. *āyiram*; Ma. *āyiram*.
S. *sūci-*, 'a needle'; Ta. *ūci*; Te. *sūdi*; Ka. *sūji*.

Many of these have other forms with *s* retained, of course changed into the Tamil *c*, as *capai*, *canti*, *camayam*, *cintu*, *ciṅkalam*, *cakacciram*, and *cūci*. In the expression *anticanti*, if *anti* is taken to mean 'evening,' *canti* may be taken to mean morning. S. *sandhyā-* means 'twilight hour,' and *anti* has come to mean 'evening' in Tamil and Malayāḷam. There is another *anti* in Tamil met with in expressions like *antikkālam*. There, of course, it is a tadbhava of S. *antya-*, 'last.' S. *siṃhala-* has undergone many changes. There is the modern tadbhava *ciṅkalam* (Te. *siṅgaḷamu*) which is employed to denote the language Singhalese, and the country inhabited by the people that speak it. But *īḻam* is derived in a different way: Pali has *sīha* corresponding to S. *siṃha-* (Prakrit also has that form. Pischel, p. 68). The Tamil tadbhava of S. *siṃhala-*, through Pali, would be *sīyaḷam*. And the stress on the first syllable has led to the dropping of *ya* after it. We thus get *sīḷam* from which by the dropping of the initial *s*, the word *īḷam* or *īḻam* is obtained. One is not inclined to attach much value to the change of *ḷ* to *ḻ*, as often the Tamils in the so-called pure-Tamil districts, Tinnevelly and Madura, make no difference between them.

s followed by *m*, it was pointed out before, drops off. Sometimes *m* drops off and the following vowel is changed, naturally into *u* or *o*.

S. *smaraṇa-*, 'recollection'; Ta. *coraṇai* } 'consciousness,' *cuṇai* } 'keen sensibility'.

s followed by *y* assimilates the *y*.

S. *syandana-* 'a car'; Ta. *cantanam*.

There is another *cantanam*, 'sandal', a tadbhava of S. *candana-*.

s followed by *r* takes an anaptyctic vowel.

S. *sruva-*, 'a sacrificial ladle'; Ta. *curuvam*.

s followed by *v* takes an anaptyctic vowel.

S. *svāmin-*, 'a lord'; Ta. *cuvāmi*.

S. *svarṇa-*, 'gold'; Ta. *cuvarṇam*.

S. *svarga-*, 'heaven'; Ta. *cuvarkkam*.

S. *svāhā-*, 'an oblation'; T. *cuvākā*.

The commoner change is the dropping of the *v* and the changing of the vowel.

S. *svāmin-*, 'a lord'; Ta. *cāmi*; Ma. *sāmi*; Te. *sāmi*; Ka. *sāmi*; Pr. *sāmi* (Pischel, p. 286); Pa. *sāmin* (Andersen, p. 268).

S. *svāminī-*, 'a lady'; Ta. *cāṉi*; Te. *ṣāni*.

S. *svapna-*, 'a dream'; Ta. *coppaṉam* } *coṟpaṉam* }

S. *svāti-*, 'name of an asterism'; Ta. *cōti*.

S. *svaya-*, 'oneself'; Ta. *cuyam* } *coyam* }; Te. *sayām* } *sayāmu* }

S. *svara-*, 'a note of the musical scale'; Ta. *curam*; Te. *soramu*.

S. *svarga-*, 'heaven'; Ta. *corkkam*.

S. *svayambhū-*, 'name of Śiva'; Ta. *cuyampu* } *cayampu* }

S. *svayamvara-*, 'choice-marriage'; Ta. *cayamaram*.

S. *svabhāva-*, 'nature'; Te. *sabāmu*.

S. *svarṇa*, 'gold'; Ta. *coṉṉam*.

S. *svalpa-*, 'insignificant'; Ta. *coṟpam*.

S. *svadēśa-*, 'one's own country'; Ta. *cutēcam*.

S. *svatantra*, 'self-dependent'; Ta. *cutantaram*.

Ta. *cāṉi* is not used alone. It is only an affix as in *turai-cāṉi*. In many of the Tamil words *u* after the initial consonant is pronounced as *o*, and in course of time is bound to be written so. *cayampu* is a classical word (the Nīlakēci, quoted in the Manimēkalai, commentary, p. 254). Evidently it is a form borrowed through Prakrit. Prakrit has *sayam* for S. *svayam* (Pischel, p 237). Pali also has that form (Andersen, p. 265).

There is in Tamil a word *contam*, 'one's own.' Sanskrit-knowing people pronounce it as *sontam* and *svantam*. Dr. Gundert gives in his dictionary *svantam* and transcribes it in English as *sondam* and indicates that it is connected with *sva* of Sanskrit. Dr. Kittel

gives in his Kannada Dictionary *svantu* and says it is equivalent to *sonta*, and makes both tadbhavas of S. *sva-*. In Brown's Telugu-English Dictionary (second edition) *svantamu* and *sontamu* are regarded as the same word and both are connected with S. *svatantra-*. If *contam* must be connected with Sanskrit, no other derivation seems to be possible. S. *svatantra-* might have been corrupted into *svantam*, rather than S. *sva-*.

S. *svatantra-*, one would expect to become *cutantiram*. Indeed the scholars are very particular about the vowel *i* before *r*, that being the natural anaptyctic vowel. But people would not have it so. *cutantaram* is a common word and perhaps looks neater to them than the word with *i*.

S. *snēha-*, 'oil, love'; Ta. *ney*, 'ghee' } Ma. *neyi* / *nai* } 'ghee'
nēya / *nēśa* } 'love'; } *nēśam*, 'a friend'

This word could have been put along with others of the same kind, the words that drop the initial *s*, with a further change as happens in *siha* of Pali. But it has undergone some curious changes, and deserves separate handling. Besides the loss of the initial *s*, the vowel is shortened when we get *ney* in Tamil and *neyi* in Malayāḷam. Malayāḷam would make it *nai* as well, the reverse case of what happens in S. *daiva* > Ma. *teyyam*. Telugu has *neyyi* and *neyi*; both mean 'ghee.' Kanarese has *ney*; Dr. Kittel is, however, not sure of its being a tadbhava of S. *snēha*. In Tamil, *ney* when used independently means 'ghee,' and in composition, 'any oily thing' as in *veṉṉey*, 'butter' (lit. 'white ghee'), *eṉṉey*, 'gingelly oil'. It is a pretty old word and one has to think well before he sets it down as a tadbhava. The chances are more with regard to *nēya*. Even in that case one has to take into consideration words like *nē*, 'affection,' found in Tamil classics like the Puṟanāṉūṟu. Assuming that *nēyam* is a tadbhava, one has to explain another form of the word *nēcam* by analogical instances, like *uyir*, *ucir*, or by metathesis. And Kanarese has *nēsta*, *nēha*, meaning 'love'. Telugu has *nēstamu*, *nēyamu*. While *nēha* and *nēyamu* can be easily explained to be tadbhavas of S. *snēha-*, Ka. *nēsta* and Te. *nēstamu* are harder to account for. S. *snēhita-* is possibly the source of these forms thus: *snēhita-* > *nēsita* > *nēsta*. Ta. *cinekita* with an anaptyctic vowel may also be noted. Compare Pali *sinēhita* (Andersen, p. 270).

S. *stambha-*, 'a pillar'; Ta. *kampam*; Ma. *kampam*.

This equation is accepted by almost all Dravidian grammarians and lexicographers. Dr. Gundert doubts the derivation. Dr. Kittel regards Ka. *kamba* or *kambha* as a tadbhava of S. *skambha-* or *stambha-*. The Telugu form is *kambamu*. That Prakrit has *khambha* and that the Prakrit word has been borrowed by all these languages is the only possible explanation. But Dr. Kittel's alternative derivation from *skhambha-* seems to be nearer the truth. Pischel

(p. 4) equates *khambha* with the Vedic *skambha-*. Grassman in his Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda (p. 1585) has given *skambha-* as meaning 'prop, support.' And the omission of the initial *s* is more natural than a change of *st* to *k*. The Tamil *kampu* meaning 'a stick', used only in the southernmost districts of the Madras Presidency—in Madras the word is *kompu*—is possibly a corruption of *kampam*.

The medial *s* followed by dental stop consonants is assimilated.

S. *astra-*, 'an arrow'; Ta. *attiram*.

S. *astamana-*, 'setting of the sun'; Ta. *attamaṉam*; Pr. *attamaṇam* (Hēmacandra's Kumārapāla-carita, V. 88).

S. *avasthā-*, 'state'; Ta. *avattai*; Pr. *avatthā* (Pischel, p. 211).

S. *pustaka-*, 'a book'; Ta. *puttakam*; Pa. *potthaka* (Andersen, p. 183).

S. *mastaka-*, 'skull'; Ta. *mattakam*; Pa. *matthaka* (Andersen, p. 201).

S. *hasta-*, 'the hand'; Ta. *attam*; Pr. *hattha* (Pischel, p. 211); Pa. *hattha* (Andersen, p. 279).

S. *hastin-*, 'an elephant'; Ta. *atti*; Pr. *hatthi* (Pischel, p. 213); Pa. *hatthin* (Andersen, p. 280).

But the medial *s* followed by a guttural or a labial is changed into *ṟ*, the alveolar *r*.

S. *bhāskara-*, 'the sun'; Ta. *pāṟkaraṉ*.

S. *āspada-*, 'a place'; Ta. *āṟpatam*.

S. *bṛhaspati-*, 'Jupiter'; Ta. *pirukaṟpati*.

The medial *s* followed by *m*, the labial nasal, is transformed into *ṟ* changing the succeeding nasal into a stop.

S. *bhasmam-*, 'ashes'; Ta. *paṟpam*.

The intermediate form *paspam* is also used by people in the sense of 'a medicinal powder.' In another connexion it has been pointed out that *paṟpam* is also a tadbhava of S. *padma-*, 'the lotus.'

The medial *s* followed by *y* takes an anaptyctic vowel.

S. *nasya-*, 'a sternutatory'; Ta. *naciyam*.

The final *-as* is replaced by *-am* in Tamil tadbhavas. Perhaps the Prakrit languages in which *-as* also becomes *-am* have exerted some influence on Tamil words.

S. *tamas-*, 'darkness'; Ta. *tamam*; Ma. *tamam*.

S. *śiras-*, 'the head'; Ta. *ciram*; Ma. *ciram*.

S. *manas-*, 'the mind'; Ta. *maṉam*; Ma. *manam*.

S. *tapas-*, 'penance'; Ta. *tavam*; Ma. *tavam*.

There are, however, later tadbhavas with *u* affixed to the Sanskrit bases: *ciracu*, *manacu*, *tavacu* and *tapacu*. *manacu* also appears as *manatu*. These words are popular; *tamam* is only classical. These later tadbhavas are the result of a second borrowing.

THE SANSKRIT SPIRANT *h*.

Its treatment in Tamil and Malayāḷam tadbhavas.

The spirant *h* is a sound not altogether foreign to Tamil. For Tamil has the *āytam h* (.˙.) which is almost an equivalent of it. But the *āytam* differs from *h* in some ways. The *āytam* is found in a very few words in Tamil and is peculiar to Tamil of all the Dravidian tongues. It is, however, not a recent introduction, being referred to in the Tolkāppiyam, the oldest Tamil grammar extant (Eḻuttatikāram, 2). Tolkāppiyar refers to it as 'the three dots known as *āytam*,' thus indicating its shape when committed to writing. And it is mere dots not a linear symbol like those for all other sounds. Again he says: "The consonant *āytam* comes in only after a short vowel and before the six vowel-consonants k, c, ṭ, t, p, and ṟ" (Eḻuttatikāram, 38). Thus it is only medial, and its use is much restricted.

Dr. Caldwell says: "Tamil makes no use whatever of aspirates, and has not borrowed any of the aspirated consonants of Sanskrit, nor even the isolated aspirate *h*. It professes to possess a letter, half vowel, half consonant, corresponding in some respects to the Sanskrit *visarga* and called *āytam* (that which is subtle, minute). It is pronounced like a guttural *h*, but is only found in the poets, and is generally considered a pedantical invention of the grammarians" (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, third edition, p. 130). Dr. Caldwell's statement regarding the Tamil *āytam* is, I am afraid, not based on a knowledge of facts. The *āytam* is not considered by any one, so far as I know, a pedantical invention of the grammarians. What could have been their purpose in inventing such a letter? This calls in question the very fundamental principle of Tamil grammar-writing. Tamil grammarians have always held that literature should precede grammar, and the fact that reference is made to the *āytam* in the Tolkāppiyam would put it beyond dispute that it is no idle invention of the grammarians.

The words in common use where the *āytam* occurs are Ta. *aẖtu*, 'that,' and Ta. *iẖtu*, 'this.' These ought to be pronounced with the aspiration, but the popular pronunciations are [ʌg̱ŭđŭ] and [ig̱ŭđŭ] where *ẖ* is represented by [g̱ŭ]. There are some words found only in books where *ẖ* occurs: Ta. *eẖku*, 'steel' is one. This is popularly pronounced as [ϵg̱ŭ] as if there were no *ẖ* at all, and it is worth noting that *eḻu* is only another form of *eẖku*, corrupted from it. Compare S. *muhūrta-*, 'a period of 48 minutes, auspicious hour' > Ta. *mukurttam* > *muḻuttam*. In the case of *eẖku*, *ẖ* cannot be pronounced as [g̱ŭ] as it is itself followed by *ku*. Ta. *kaẖcu*, 'a weight, ¼ oz.', is another word, and is pronounced as [kʌg̱ŭsŭ]. Some other words are Ta. *aẖkam*, food-grain' and Ta. *veẖku*, 'desire ardently.'

The *āytam* sometimes comes in when words combine as in the case of *pal* + *tuḷi* = *pahṟuḷi*, 'many drops', which is pronounced [pʌguṟuḷi]. There is also another compound, *paṟṟuḷi*. Ta. *muhṭitu*, 'the thorn is bad', is another example. This is pronounced [mugŭḍīđŭ]. There is *muṭṭitu* as well.

The tendency of modern speech, however, it must be admitted, is to discard the *āytam* altogether. The words *ahtu* and *ihtu* referred to above are about the only ones commonly met with, but only in books and in pedantic speech. They are also acknowledged to be variants of *atu* and *itu*, and considered to be necessary when these words are in sandhi followed by words beginning with a vowel or *y*, e.g., *ahtaṭuppu*, 'that is the oven', *ihtūr*, 'this is a village'. But to argue from that circumstance that the *āytam* is only an invention of the grammarians is like arguing that the letter *ṟ* is an invention of the Telugu or Kannada grammarians because modern speech makes no distinction between *r* and *ṟ*, or rather knows only *r*.

Sanskrit words where *h* occurs, when they enter Tamil, invariably have it changed. It must be noted, however, that in recent times, the Grantha symbol has been adopted in the Tamil alphabet, and is often found used in books, especially school books. When it does change, it follows certain laws. When *h* is initial, it disappears in the tadbhavas.

S. *hari-*, 'Viṣṇu'; Ta. *ari*; Ma. *ari*.
S. *hastin-*, 'an elephant'; Ta. *atti*; Ma. *atti*.
S. *hita-*, 'wholesome'; Ta. *itam*, 'good'; Te. *itavu*.
S. *hima-*, 'snow'; Ta. *imam*; Ma. *imam*.
S. *hr̥daya-*, 'the heart'; Ta. *itayam*.
S. *hiṅgu-*, 'asafœtida'; Te. *iṅguva*.
S. *hēman-*, 'gold'; Ta. *ēmam*.
S. *haiyaṅgavīna-*, 'butter'; Ta. *aiyaṅkavīṉam*.
S. *hōrā-*, 'an hour'; Ta. *ōrai*.

When it is medial, it is replaced by *k*, of course with the sound it usually has when medial, or is assimilated to a previous anusvāra.

S. *āhuti-*, 'an oblation offered to a deity'; Ta. *ākuti.* / *āvuti.*

S. *mōha-*, 'illusion of attachment or love'; Ta. *mōkam*; Ma. *mōkam*.

S. *siṃha-*, 'a lion'; Ta. *ciṅkam* / *cimmam*; Ma. *ciṅkam* / *ciṅṅam*; Te. *singamu*.

S. *saṃhāra-*, 'destruction'; Ta. *caṅkāram* / *cammāram*

The change of *h* into *v* cannot be regarded as an apparent change. The change of *k* into *v* is common in pure Tamil words, e.g., *ākum* > *āvum*; *makaṉ* > *mavaṉ*; *pakal* > *paval*. S. *narahari-*, 'man-lion', Ta. *naravari* cannot come under this category as *v* comes

in as a glide thus: *nara + hari = nara + ari = nara(v)ari*. Ta.—Ma. *ciṅkam* is not anything peculiar to these languages. Prakrit can show *siṅgh*. Pischel gives *siṅgha* from S. *siṃha-*, and *saṃghāra* from S. *saṃhāra-* (p. 184).

Again the medial *h* is changed into *y* in some cases.

S. *parihāsa-*, 'joking, jesting'; Ta. *pariyācam*.

S. *mahiṣa-*, 'a buffalo'; Ta. *mayiṭam*.

S. *mahēndra-*, 'name of a mountain range'; Ta. *mayēntiram*.

In all these cases, there is the alternative tadbhava with *k*. *y* seems to have crept in as a glide, as in *narahari*, when *h* was dislodged, e.g., *mahiṣa* > *maïḍa* > *mayiḍa* or Ta. *mayiṭam*. The *y*-glide has evidently been suggested by the *i* that precedes or follows. Ta. *dakikka* (S. *dah*) and Ta. *vakikka* (S. *vah*) are pronounced as if they were written *dayikka* and *vayikka*. Malayāḷam has the colloquial *vayyā* for *vahiyā*, 'intolerable, impossible'. Telugu has *bayilu*, 'the open', obviously from S. *bahiṣ-*. The Hindustani *nahi* is colloquially *nayi* or *nai*. Compare also Ta. *mailāppūr* supposed to be connected with S. *mahiṣārūpya-*, and *maisūr* (Mysore) with S. *mahiṣāpura-*.

The following compounds follow the rule mentioned above regarding words that have a medial *h*. Although *h* is initial in the second words of these compounds, the compounds have to be regarded as single words.

S. *paramahaṃsa-*, 'an ascetic of the highest order'; Ta. *paramakañcaṉ*.

S. *śiśuhatyā-*, 'child-murder, infanticide'; Ta. *cicukatti*.

Strictly viewed, these compounds should be *parama + añcaṉ = parama* (*v*) *añcaṉ*, *cicu + atti = cicu* (*v*) *atti*. But these have not been treated as compounds. Thus there is no initial *h* in these, it is only medial. And the medial has, following the usual rule, become *k*. But the medial *k* is hardly *k*, and is often interchangeable with *v*, as has been shown above. Compare also *nōvum*, *nōkum*; *nāval*, *nākal* (in *nākappaḻam*). The medial *k* has a peculiar sound-value in Tamil. Of course it is that of *g* when it follows its nasal. Some people would pronounce it as *g* in other places as well. Others would make it an equivalent of *h* and pronounce it as an aspirate. This appears to be due to Sanskrit influence. Others again would pronounce it as *k*, unvoiced velar pure and simple. The correct pronunciation of the *k* between vowels, however, seems to be none of these but that very nearly akin to the modern Greek γ. Dr. Gundert adopted this symbol in transcribing the Malayāḷam words with the medial *k* in his Malayāḷam Dictionary. It may be noted in this connexion that Tamil shows a need for such symbols in the case of the medial *t*, and the medial *p*, and also in the case of the medial *ṭ*, e.g., Ta., *atu*, 'that', is neither [atŭ] nor [adŭ], it is [ađŭ]; Ta. *urupu*, 'particle', is neither [urupŭ] nor [urubŭ], it is [uruʋŭ]; Ta. *kaṭal*, 'the sea' is neither [kʌṭəl]

nor [kʌḍəl], it is [kʌđəl]. The International Phonetic Association seems to have felt no need for this last symbol. But there is the spirantal sound in the case of the lingual also. It is not the voiceless nor the voiced sound that is heard but a spirantal sound which will pair off with g, ð, and ʋ.

Dr. Gundert wrote his Dictionary half a century ago. It has become a fashion with the Malayāḷam-speaking educated men to contend that their alphabet is perfect, and that each sound has its proper value in Malayāḷam words. Thus they would not admit with Dr. Gundert that Ma. *kāṭu* and Ma. *patir* should be pronounced as [ka:ḍŭ,] and [pʌđir] but would pronounce them giving the *ṭ* and *t* their normal value. Ordinary people, however, keep to the feature that Malayāḷam shares with Tamil, and do not appear to make any effort to pronounce them otherwise. It may perhaps be confidently asserted that these very men who want to give these symbols their normal value, taken unawares, may betray the popular tendency.

Elsewhere the peculiar sound-value of the medial *c* between vowels has been noticed. In this connexion it may be well to point out that the value of the medial *c* between vowels in Tamil is neither that of the palatal *ś* nor that of the dental *s*, but is a thing by itself. To one who observes the sound subtly, the medial *c* appears to be something midway between *ś* and *s*. It might have had the value of the Sanskrit *j* or an approach to it sometime in the history of the language. Malayāḷam to this day preserves this peculiarity. And Dr. Gundert rightly indicates it by a symbol related to *j*, i.e., *ǰ*. S. *ācāram* = Ma. *āǰāram*. When the Sanskrit word itself has *j*, Dr. Gundert adopts a slightly different symbol, e.g., S. *ajayam* = Ma. *aǰayam*. If this pronunciation were current in Tamil, it would enable one to pair this off along with the other spirantal sounds indicated already. As all other symbols are but modifications of the symbols for voiced consonants, this would complete the symmetry. But Tamil perhaps owing to Sanskrit influence has altered the pronunciation of the medial *c*, and there it remains, a sound between *ś* and *s* as already pointed out. The same is the value of the initial *c* also in modern Tamil. *c* preceded by its nasal is *j*; and preceded by another *c*, it regains its palatal sound.

When the medial *h* is found in Sanskrit words before a consonant, it is either assimilated to that consonant or elided.

S. *vahni-*, 'fire'; Ta. *vanni.*

S. *brahman-*, 'the creator'; Ta. *piramaṉ*; Te. *bomma.*

S. *madhyāhna-*, 'noon'; Ta. *mattiyāṉam.*

In some words when *h* happens to be between vowels (*a*'s) it is neither merely lost nor assimilated as already pointed out, but lengthens the vowel that precedes it before disappearing.

S. *kalaha-*, 'quarrel'; Ta. *kalām.*

S. *grahaṇa-*, 'an eclipse'; Ta. *kiraṇam.*
S. *mahat-*, 'greatness'; Ta. *māttu.*
S. *rahasya-*, 'secret'; Ta. *rāciyam.*
S. *gahana-*, 'the sky'; Ta. *kāṉam.*
S. *sahavāsa-*, 'dwelling together'; Ta. *cāvācam.*
S. *sahasra-*, 'a thousand'; Ka. *sāviram*; Ta. *āyiram.*

This kind of change is met with in pure Tamil words too. Ta. *akam*, 'a house,' of course pronounced as if it were *aham* by the Brāhman people, has an alternative form *ām.* Ta. *āttāḷ*, *āmuṭaiyāṉ*, etc., are all compounds of *ām* or *akam.* The Sanskrit word *aham*, 'I', never takes this form except in the compound *āṅkāram* for S. *ahaṅkāra-.* Compare Ta. *pakal*, *pāl*; S. *śakaṭa-*, Ta. *cakaṭu* and *cāṭu.*

S. *mahān-*, 'the active agency of nature, a great man'; Ta. *māṉ.*

In this as well as in the Hindustani *mahāl* which becomes *māl*, e.g., the Tirumalaināyakkaṉ Māl at Madura, *ah* is assimilated to the long vowel *ā* that follows.

LIST OF BOOKS AND PAPERS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO.

Abhinava Maṅga Rāja: Maṅga Rāja Nighaṇṭu or Kavi Maṅgābhidhāna. [Kanarese.]

Amarasiṃha: Amarakōśa. [Sanskrit.]

Andersen: Pali Reader, Part II: Glossary.

Āndhranāma-saṅgrahamu. [Telugu.]

Āndhranāma-śēṣamu. [Telugu.]

Apte, V. S.: Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary.

Aracakēcari: Irakuvamicam. [Tamil.]

Aruṇandi Śivācārya: Śivajñāna-siddhiyār. [Tamil.]

Avirotiyāḻvār: Tirunūṟṟantāti. [Tamil.]

Avvaiyār: Konṟaivēntaṉ. [Tamil.]

Beschi, J.: Caturakarāti. [Tamil.]

Bhaṭṭākalaṅka: Karṇāṭaka-śābdānuśāsana. [Sanskrit.]

Böhtlinck and Roth: Petersburg Sanskrit Wörterbuch.

Brown, C. P.: Telugu-English Dictionary (Second edition, 1903).

Caldwell: A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages (Second edition, 1875).

Caldwell: A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages (Third edition, 1913).

Cāttaṉār, Kūlavāṇikaṉ: Maṇimēkalai. [Tamil.]

Cinnayya Sūri: Bālavyākaraṇamu. [Telugu.]

Ekākṣara-nighaṇṭu. [Sanskrit.]

Fick: Indogermanisches Wörterbuch.

Grassman: Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda.

Gundert, H.: A Malayāḷam and English Dictionary (1872).

Do. A Grammar of the Malayāḷam Language (1868). [Malayāḷam.]

Do. The Dravidian Element in Sanskrit (Journal of the German Oriental Society 1869).

Hēmacandra: Kumārapāla-carita. [Prakrit.]

Henry, Victor: Précis de Grammaire Palie.

Kapilar: Kuriñcippāṭṭu. [Tamil.]

Kēśirāja: Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam. [Kanarese.]

Kētana: Āndhra-bhāṣā-bhūsaṇamu. [Telugu.]

Kittel, F.: Kannaḍa Dictionary.

Do. A Grammar of the Kannaḍa Language.

Do. The Dravidian Element in Sanskrit Dictionaries (Indian Antiquary for August 1872).

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: Tantravārttika. [Sanskrit.]

Manṭalapuruṭar: Cūṭāmaṇi-nikaṇṭu. [Tamil.]

Māṇikkavācakar: Tirukkōvaiyār. [Tamil.]

Do. : Tiruvācakam. [Tamil.]

Muṭattāmakkaṇṇiyār: Porunarāṟṟuppaṭai. [Tamil.]

Muttucāmi Kavirāyar : Nānārtha-dīpikai. [Tamil.]
Naccinārkkiṉiyar : Commentary on Tolkāppiyam, Collatikāram. [Tamil.]
Nāgavarma : Karṇāṭaka-bhāṣā-bhūṣaṇam. [Sanskrit.]
Nakkīraṉār : Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai. [Tamil.]
Nālaṭiyār. [Tamil].
Nālāyira-prabandham. [Tamil.]
Nallantuvaṉār : Kalittokai. [Tamil.]
Nannayya : Nannayya-Bhattīyamu. [Telugu.]
New Tamil Dictionary of the University of Madras (in preparation).
Nīlakēci. [Tamil.]
Oldenberg, H. : Buddha.
Parañcōti Munivar : Tiruviḷaiyāṭaṟpurāṇam. [Tamil.]
Patiṟṟuppattu. [Tamil.]
Pattuppāṭṭu. [Tamil.]
Pavaṇanti Munivar : Naṉṉūl. [Tamil.]
Peruṅkaucikaṉār : Malaipaṭukaṭām. [Tamil.]
Piṅkala-nikaṇṭu. [Tamil.]
Pischel, R. : Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen.
Pope, G. U. : A Larger Grammar of the Tamil Language in both its dialects.
Puṟanāṉūṟu. [Tamil.]
Rājarāja Varma : Kēraḷa-Pāṇinīyam. [Malayāḷam.]
Do. Śabdaśōdhinī. [Malayāḷam.]
Rāmacaritam. [Malayāḷam.]
Śaiva-tirumuṟaikaḷ, comprising the Tēvaram, Tiruvācakam, etc. [Tamil.]
Seshagiri Prabhu, M. and Krishnan, M : Vyākaraṇa-mitram. [Malayāḷam.]
Sītarāmācāryulu : Śabdaratnākaramu. [Telugu.]
Śivajñāna Yōgi : Kāñcippurāṇam. [Tamil.]
Subrahmaṇya Dīkṣitar : Prayōga-vivēkam. [Tamil.]
Svāminātha Dēśikar : Ilakkaṇakkottu. [Tamil.]
Tamilccollakarāti of the Madura Tamil Sangham.
Tiruttakka Tēvar : Jīvaka-cintāmaṇi. [Tamil.]
Tiruvaḷḷuvar : Tirukkuṟaḷ. [Tamil.]
Tolkāppiyam, Collatikāram. [Tamil.]
Toṇḍadārya : Karṇāṭaka-śabdamañjari. [Kanarese.]
Tōlāmoḻittēvar : Cūḷāmaṇi. [Tamil.]
Uhlenbeck : Etymological Dictionary of Sanskrit.
Do. Manual of Sanskrit Phonetics.
Uruttiraṅkaṇṇaṉār : Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaṭai. [Tamil.]
Villiputtūrāḻvār : Mahābhāratam. [Tamil.]
Vinson, Julien : Manual de la Langue Tamoule.
Vīrēśaliṅgam Pantulu : Lives of Telugu Poets. [Telugu.]
Vyāsa : Māhabhārata. [Sanskrit.]

REMARKS.

Mr. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai has dealt, in my opinion, in a highly praiseworthy way with an important section of the data bearing upon the relation of Sanskrit and the Prakrit dialects to the Dravidian languages, more especially to Tamil and Malayāḷam. The material that has been collected and arranged cannot but be of great value to future investigators. I venture to add the following remarks, more by way of accompaniment than by way of comment.

It is a well-known law that, when one speech-community borrows from another, the imported words are inevitably modified in accordance with the speech-habits of the importing community. Old Irish possessed no *p*, and when it imported the Latin word *purpura*, 'purple', it changed it into *corcur*. In French there are numerous words of Teutonic origin which show an initial guttural in place of an original *w*-sound. Some of these, as is well-known, were brought to England by the Normans and now form part of the Anglo-Norman element in English, such as *guard* by the side of *ward*, *guise* by the side of *wise*. Similarly the Hindustani *k͟hāki*, 'like dust, dust-coloured,' is regularly pronounced, as a borrowed word, with an initial *k* instead of the sound heard in the Scotch *loch*. It is with such changes as these in the case of Sanskrit or Sanskritic words borrowed by Dravidian peoples that Mr. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai is mainly concerned.

The Dravidians of Southern India have borrowed a great number of such words. To a large extent they are cultural terms, but there is also a considerable number of purely Āryan vocables expressive of ideas for which the language already possessed sound-symbols. This seems to be especially the case with Malayāḷam, and it is interesting to note the curious changes in meaning which such borrowings frequently show. I would instance the words Ma. *samsāri*, 'to converse' [S. *samsāra-*, 'the (constantly recurring) course of mundane existence'], Ma. *tāmasi*, 'linger, loiter,' (S. *tāmasa-*, from *tamas-*, 'darkness, the guṇa or quality of ignorance etc.'), Ma. *dāhi*, Ta. *tāki*, 'be thirsty' (S. *dāha-*, 'burning, feverish heat'). Similarly Ta. *mōcam*, in the sense of 'deceit, treachery', bears a meaning quite foreign to the S. *moṣam*, 'theft,' with which it seems to be connected. Ta. *coraṇai* or *curaṇai*, 'sensation,' moreover, is fairly widely removed in meaning from the original S. *smaraṇa-*, 'memory.' It need hardly be said that these changes in meaning need as careful investigation as the changes in form.

These borrowings, whatever modifications they may present, affect only the vocabulary. In structure the Dravidian languages of the south have remained true to the old type. With the race or races who occupied the greater portion of northern India in

primitive times the case is different. These came at a very early period into direct contact with the encroaching Āryans, and here we find a state of things quite analogous to that which obtained in those parts of Europe into which Roman soldiers and Roman settlers successfully penetrated. The Romance languages may well be called Prakrits of Latin, and there can be little doubt that the history of the rise of these new languages in Europe is closely akin to that of the rise of the Middle Indian languages of India. In each case a period of more or less complete bilingualism must have preceded the establishment of the supremacy of the invading speech ; and in each case the victorious language emerged greatly modified by the speech-habits of the invaded areas. In the Prakrits and in the Roman languages the local sounds, the local idioms, the local sentence-structure made their influence felt upon the adopted speech. In French the word for 'eighty' is *quatre-vingts*, i.e., 'four twenties.' Latin has *octoginta*; but in Modern Irish the word is *ceithre fichid* and in Modern Welsh *pedwar ugain*, both showing the same idiom as French. This was evidently a Keltic, and therefore Gallic, way of reckoning, and the Latin was modified in accordance with it. The running on of a final consonant when the next word begins with a vowel (as in *vous-avez* 'you have') is characteristic of Keltic sandhi. And such Keltic peculiarities are frequently to be met with. Similarly, in India, the element of local colour is, I think, unmistakable.

This element presents an aspect which harmonizes well with the assumption that the northern parts of India were once occupied mainly by Dravidians. The Dravidian languages employ only post-positions : the Middle Indian dialects—the Prakrits, including Pali—, and the Modern Indian dialects, their lineal descendants, have completely abandoned prepositions and have substituted post-positions for them. The dative termination of nouns both in the vernaculars of the north of India and the Dravidian languages of the south consists of a *k*-sound (sometimes modified to a *g*-sound) followed by some vowel. The same grammatical psychology lies behind the Hindī *naukar-lōg-kō*, 'to the servants,' and the Tamil *viṭu-kaḷ-ukku*, 'to the houses'; both are distinctly agglutinative in type. The use of *iruntu* in the formation of the ablative in Tamil is quite parallel with the use of *hōi*, 'having been,' in the same case in Oṛīyā. Similarly the generalization of *kāraṉ* in Tamil as a suffix denoting an agent, 'one who has to do with something', is answered in Hindī by a similar use of *wālā* (S. *pāla-*, 'protector'); one often hears in Madras *pāni-wālā* substituted for *taṉṉir-kkāraṉ*, 'water-man.' Both in the north and the south the word for 'foot', is used to denote 'a quarter,' and in both these areas are to be found single words expressing the notions 'one-and-a-half' and 'two-and-a-half,' respectively. Moreover, the comparative and superlative have ceased to be expressed morphologically in the Sanskritic

areas and have never been so expressed in the Dravidic areas: Malayāḷam *itu at-il nallatākunnu* is comparable in structure with Hindī *yih us-sē acchā hai*, 'this is better than that'; both languages employ a post-position (Ma. *-il*, locative; H. *-sē*, ablative) and a positive. Marāṭhī agrees with Kanarese (and other Dravidian tongues) in its method of expressing indirect narration: the direct speech is made indirect by adding in Marâthī *hmaṇūn*, a gerund from the root *hmaṇ*, in Kanarese *endu*, an adverbial participle from the root *en*, both roots meaning 'say.' Again the use of what may be called a gerundial construction is characteristic of both north and south. Hindī *lē-ā*, 'bring (thou),' *lē-jā*, 'take (thou) away,' are very un-Indogermanic in type, but answer perfectly to the Dravidic idiom, e.g., to Tamil *koṇṭu-vā, koṇṭu-pō*. These resemblances—and many more could be adduced—point unmistakably to the existence of a Dravidic substratum in the languages of nothern India.

This Dravidian element makes its influence felt in the sounds employed, not only in the Sanskritic vernaculars, but, to a certain extent, in Sanskrit itself. The cerebral stops, so characteristic of Dravidian, are found even in the earliest Sanskrit. Sanskrit ज (*j*) stands for an original *z*-sound, which is regularly preserved in Avestan: S. *jantu-*, 'creature', is in Avestan *zantu*; S. *ajati*, 'he drives,' is *azaiti*, and so on. In northern India to-day the words containing a *z*-sound that have been imported from Persian (or Arabic) are popularly pronounced with a *j*: *zīn*, 'saddle', is usually *jīn*; *ḥuzūr*, lit. 'presence', usually *hujūr*. Just as the Dravidian languages of the south have no true *z*, so in the north no true *z* appears to have been known. In the Middle Indian dialects the three sibilants of Sanskrit, श (*ś*) (palatal), ष (*ṣ*) (cerebral) and स (*s*) (dental), are, as a rule, reduced to one, and, similarly, the modern vernaculars only employ one *s*-sound; Hindī, for example, has *s* only, Bengali *ś* only. I am inclined to connect this treatment of the sibilants with the fact that in the Tamil alphabet, as in the Vaṭṭeḻuttu script upon which it is based, there is no symbol for *s*. In the Tamil-Malayāḷam country, at least, the pronunciation of the voiceless *s*, as well as the voiced *z*, evidently formed a difficulty, and it would appear that our (assumed) Dravidians of the north had no very good ear for sibilants of any sort. It seems to me that the evidence supplied by words borrowed from Sanskrit indicates that the pronunciation of ச as a palatal *s*, which is heard over a very large portion of the Tamil-speaking area, is a comparatively recent development. Had this pronunciation existed in early times, Tamil would never have had recourse to த(*t*) to represent Sanskrit *s* between vowels but would surely have employed ச(c) as it does in what appear to be modernized forms, மாசம் (*mācam*) 'month', for instance, by the side of the older மாதம் (*mātam*). The sound of த between vowels (like the *th* of *then*) was a lisping approximation to the sibilant of the original, and

evidently seemed to the speakers to come nearer to this sibilant than the then pronunciation of ச. I think there can be little doubt that the early pronunciation of ச was that which it has now when doubled, and which the corresponding letter still retains in Malayāḷam, viz., that of Sanskrit च. Between vowels, single consonants in Tamil, except when a Sanskritizing pronunciation is affected, are always (1) voiced and (2) spirantal, or fricative. It seems probable that the voicing preceded the spirantalization, that, for example, when the Sanskrit word *pitā* (nom.) was borrowed into Tamil, the original *t*-sound became first *d* and then the sound which the த of the Tamil word (பிதா) now represents—a voiced spirant dental. Similarly the ச of the word ஆகாசம் (*ākācam*) was almost certainly in earliest times, as in Malayāḷam to-day, pronounced as the Sanskrit ज, English *j*, the voiced sound corresponding to Sanskrit च, English *ch* as in *church*, which would have been, I contend, the pronunciation of ச as an initial consonant. I consider it to be highly probable that the spelling ஆகாயம் (*akayām*) represents the further stage of spirantalization—the tongue remaining in approximately the same position, but the air-passage being less obstructed, the resulting sound, therefore, assuming a character verging upon that of the vowel.

With the above view of the original pronunciation of the sign ச, initial and medial, in mind, I should like to offer a suggestion as to the possible source of the word *pūjā*. I do so with some hesitation since it involves to a certain extent the assumption that what is true of Primitive Tamil is also true of Primitive Dravidian in general. The word *pūjā* is distinctly a Sanskrit word and as such appears in Kanarese as *pūje*, in Telugu as *pūja*, in Tamil as *pūcai*, and in Malayālam as *pūja*. The pronunciation *j* (and not *dz*) in the Telugu word, and the spelling with *j* (and not *c*) in the Malayāḷam word are indications that these words are considered to be of Sanskrit origin; and the final vowel in all the above four words can well be explained as resulting from a final long *ā* in a borrowed Sanskrit word, when this word is feminine. In Tamil, when a masculine form in *-ā* was borrowed from Sanskrit, a slight *u*-sound seems to have been tacked on. This sound is no longer heard in nominative forms in Tamil (though it is still present in such forms in the kindred Malayāḷam, for example, in *pitā-vu*, *ātmā-vu*, from the Sanskrit nominatives *pitā*, *ātmā*), but forms like the accusatives *pitā-v-ai*, *āṉmā-v-ai* (Ma. *pitā-v-e*, *ātmā-v-e*) seem clearly to show traces of such a sound. On the other hand, when the borrowed word in *-ā* was feminine, a slight *i*-sound seems to have been added, akin, apparently, to the short *i* that marks the feminine in such words as *aṭi*, used in calling a female of a lower caste, *māmi*, 'aunt,' *ampaṭṭacci* or *ampaṭṭatti*, 'a barber's wife,' and possibly in *maṉuṣi*, 'woman,' etc. This *-ā-i* in a final unaccented syllable would naturally become shortened to *-ai* just as, for instance,

tāy (i.e., *tā-i*) 'mother,' lit. 'yielder, producer, parent' (from the root *tā*) becomes in composition *-tai*, as in *mun-tai*, 'ancestor, forefather.' Hence in such Sanskritic feminines final *-ai* (an *e*-sound) in Tamil and in Malayāḷam final *-a*, with the *i* (or *y*) reasserting itself in sandhi (e.g., *pūja-y-uṇṭu* 'there is worship'). The final *-e* in such words in Kanarese appears to be of a similar origin, and therefore, probably, or at least possibly, the final *-a* in Telugu.*

In Sanskrit we find a root *pūj*, and at first sight it might seem that this was a development from the simpler radical *pū*, 'purify,' in the same way as the Sanskrit root *yuj*, 'join,' is a development from *yu*, 'unite.' But there are serious difficulties in the way of such an explanation. The Sanskrit root *pū* has its counterpart in other Indo-germanic languages, but one looks in vain for traces of a root *pūj* outside of India,—not even in Avestan, that has so much in common with Sanskrit, is such a radical to be found. And in Sanskrit itself formations from a root *pūj* are very rare before the sūtra-period. The form *pūjana-* occurs once in the Ṛg-veda in an epithet of Indra, *śāci-pūjana* voc. (viii, 17, *v.* 12) the translation of which is uncertain †; the verbal forms *apūjan* (a doubtful reading), and *pupūjire* occur once each in the Mahābhārata; *pūjā-*'honour, worship' and the so-called causative verb *pūjayati,-te*, 'treat with respect or reverence,' are found in sūtra-literature, in the epics (along with a few other derivatives) and, of course, in classical Sanskrit. There can be little doubt that all this indicates that our so-called root *pūj* is an abstraction that arose in India, and that it is not of Indo-germanic origin. The word *pūjā* is Sanskrit in the same sense that the word *bishop* is English. This is, of course, from the Latin *episcopus*, which is, again, from the Greek ἐπίσκοπος. The word *bishop* undoubtedly belongs to the English language, although of Græco-Latin origin, and the word *pūjā* as undoubtedly belongs to the Sanskrit language, although almost certainly of Dravidic origin.

Gundert in his Malayāḷam dictionary suggests that *pūjā* may be derived from the Primitive Dravidic base which in Tamil appears as *pūcu* with the meaning 'smear, anoint, wash, adorn.' This word would then seem to have had reference originally to the smearing (with saffron-paste, etc.)—possibly also to the washing and adorning—of an image or symbol of some deity as a mark of honour, or as part of the ritual of worship. I wish to suggest another etymology. I would connect the word with the Tamil *pū*,

---

* These are exceptions, due mainly to the influence of analogy. The final *-ā* of *mātā* 'mother' appears to be due to association of this word with its correlative *pitā* 'father.' In composition such words seem regularly to retain the Sanskrit termination. The final *-ai* of *mahimai*, from *S. mahimā*, 'greatness' (a nom. from the mas. stem *mahiman-*), is clearly due to the influence of the numerous Tamil abstract nouns in *-mai*.

† 'Honouring or acknowledging zeal' (Grassmann), 'honoured by Śaci' (Ludwig), 'honouring the strong ones' (Wackernagel), 'worshipped well' (Griffith, following Sāyana).

'flower,'—I do not, of course, mean to say that the word is necessarily of Tamil origin. The Tamil verb *pūci* (Ma. *pūji*, etc.) would appear to be a secondary formation based upon the Sanskrit *pūjā*-. Such verbal formations are as a general rule formed from Sanskrit nominal stems—*vāci*, 'read,' from *vāc*-, *vādi*, 'argue, discuss,' from *vāda*-, etc.—rather than from Sanskrit verbal stems. But in Winslow's dictionary the first meaning given to *pūci* is 'offer *flowers*, etc., in worship.' The Sanskrit *pūjā*- would hardly warrant such a meaning in a verb-form derived from it. This leads me to suggest —at present very tentatively—that in this Tamil verb there is a reminiscence of the original meaning of the Sanskrit *pūjā*-; that this in fact, is from a Primitive Dravidic compound which in Tamil would have appeared as *pū-cey*. I repeat, this is a mere suggestion. But it may be pointed out that, granted a primitive *pū-cey*, used in the sense of 'flower-act, offering flowers' (cp. the Sanskrit *paśu-karman*- 'an animal offering', *karman*, from the Sanskrit root *kr̥*, 'make'), it would be impossible for Sanskrit speaking people to distinguish between a final *-ey* (or *-ei*) and a final *-ay* (or *-ai*); for the short *e* was a sound unknown. This being so, during a stage of bilingualism such as I have spoken of above, it would not be unnatural, when so many Sanskrit words ending in *-ā* were pronounced by Dravidians as ending in *-ai*, for the Āryan community to Sanskritize a Dravidian word ending in *-ay* or *-ai* by changing this into *-ā*. The word *pūjā* would then be a Dravidic word that passed with slight modification into Sanskrit and then, again with slight modification, back into Dravidian. Such migrations of words are common enough. The old German word *Beiwache*, for instance, meaning 'watch,' as a military term, passed into French as *bivouac*, a word which we have borrowed from the French; it was then re-imported into German as *Bivouac* or *Biwak*. That a similar migration has taken place in the case of some early cognate of Tamil *pūcai*, etc., admits of hardly any doubt. Whether my interpretation of the history of these words is correct must, however, remain an uncertainty. There is every need of further investigation.

The word *śambhu*-, as a vedic epithet, is well-known to be derived from *Śam*, 'blessing, welfare, prosperity,' plus the radical *bhū*, 'be, become,' and to mean 'being a blessing, beneficent.' As a name in later times, of Śiva, I feel that it is likely to have been chosen because it suggested in the minds of the speakers some Dravidian word akin to the Tamil *cem*, 'redness' (cp. Tamil *cempu*, 'copper'), the colour red being always associated with this deity. That is to say, the application of this epithet to Śiva— a euphemistic application—seems to me to become more intelligible under the above assumption of the existence in Northern India at an early period of a race or of races related to the Dravidians of the South. *Śambhu* as a name of Śiva, becomes in Tamil *campu*, which, if an early

importation, would, as I argue, have been originally pronounced with an initial sound like that of the English *church*. I venture the suggestion that this word has reverted to Sanskrit from some Dravidic dialect in the form *jambu*, as a name of Śiva bearing the connotation of 'redness, reddishness.' Both *jambuka*- and *śiva*- are used to denote a jackal, possibly because of the tawny colour of this animal (?). And, when it is considered that the area characterized pre-eminently by the worship of Śiva must have lain originally south of the zone into which Āryan civilization had advanced, it will not, I think, be felt to be impossible that it was to this unknown region that the expression *jambu-dvīpa*, 'the Śiva-country,' first had reference.

According to the mythic geography of Paurāṇic lore, Jambu-dvīpa derives its name from a gigantic rose-apple tree growing on mount Meru, which overlooked this continent, the name for a rose-apple tree being *jambu*- or *jambū*-. Is it too much to suggest that here again we have Dravidic intrusion and confusion? I know of no modern authority for a conceivable early **cem-pū-maram*, in the sense of 'rose, or rose-like tree.' But it is curious that the Hindustani name for this tree is made up of the word for rose, *gulāb* (lit. 'rose-water'), plus a derivative from the word *jambu*- —*gulāb-jāman*. This would, of course, imply a very late date for the origin of this myth.

Sanskrit श (ś) is so regularly represented in Tamil by ச that one hesitates to accept *tiru*, 'Lakṣmī, wealth, beauty,' as directly connected with the Sanskrit *śrī*-. It might be from the Prakrit (Mahārāṣṭrī) *siri*, which is from the Sanskrit *śrī*-. But the representation of an initial *s*- sound by a *t*, though fairly common in Malayāḷam, is extremely rare in Tamil. I surmise that since *śrī* is frequently pronounced as *strī*, which is the Sanskrit word for 'woman,' some contamination has taken place between these two words. Sanskrit *strī* becomes *tiri* or *tiri* in Tamil, and Sanskrit *śrī* is represented in Malayāḷam by *tiru* or at the end of a word by *tiri*. The final -*u* remains a difficulty. It may be due to a rapid, unaccented pronunciation of *tiri*, regarded as equivalent to *śrī*, as *tr̥*; or it may be due to the influence of the radical element in *tiru-ttu*, 'set right,' some connexion being felt to exist between 'rightness, correctness' and 'beauty, prosperity.'

I will make but one other remark. In a form like Tamil *kēṭkiṟēṉ*, 'I hear,' the *ḷ* of the root *kēḷ* passes before a stop consonant into the corresponding stop of its own series, viz. *ṭ*. There takes place a species of assimilation unknown to students of Indogermanic philology. Just as, between vowels, an original stop consonant becomes spirantal, becomes, as it were, assimilated to the adjacent vowels taking on something of their nature, so when a spirantal sound like *ḷ*, for instance, is juxtaposed to a stop consonant like *k*, it takes on, by a similar kind of assimilation, something of the nature of the

following sound—it assumes, not the place of articulation of this sound, but the kind of articulation. So in the case of borrowings from Sanskrit. The Sanskrit *puṣkala-* 'plenteous,' is represented by *puṭkalam*, the Sanskrit *āspada-*, 'seat, site,' by *ātpatam*; *ṭ* being the corresponding stop to the cerebral *ṣ*, *t* the corresponding stop to the dental *s* of the Sanskrit word. Now the latter word is also represented in Tamil by *āṟpatam*. It seems to me perfectly clear that the sound of *r* (ற) in such a position was not, at the time when this and similar words were imported, the 'rough, vibrating *r*' that Pope in his Handbook sets down as the value of this symbol. It was clearly consonantal, like its alternative *t* (த). It was almost certainly an alveolar stop resembling our English *t* (probably with modifications which may, for the present, be overlooked). That is to say, its place of articulation lay between that of the dental *t* (த) and that of the cerebral *ṭ* (ட). It would seem, therefore, that when *l* (ல) alternates with *r* (ற), as in *niṟkiṟēṉ*, 'I stand,' it was alveolar in nature. In this connexion it may be pointed out that evidence seems clearly to indicate that the Tamil symbol ழ, which, in consideration of a wide-spread pronunciation of this letter, has been transliterated in these articles as *ḻ*, was certainly originally a cerebral *r*. It seems, in the first place, unreasonable to suppose that one and the same sound was represented originally by two symbols: in Malayāḷam there is practically no distinction in pronunciation between the symbols corresponding to the Tamil ள and ழ, and in Tamil these symbols are pronounced alike over a large area. And then the facts supplied by Kanarese point clearly to a primitive distinction between the sounds corresponding to these symbols in that language. In early Kanarese the symbol ೞ is the representative of Tamil ழ. But this symbol cannot be dissociated in form from the symbol ಱ, the neighbouring alveolar sound, as I suggest, corresponding to Tamil ற. It was evidently emphatically an *r*-sound and quite distinct from the sound represented by ಳ, the Tamil ள, as emphatically a cerebral *l*- sound.

M. COLLINS.